

JPRS-UPA-89-041
27 JUNE 1989



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

JPRS Report

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

Soviet Union

Political Affairs

JPRS-UPA-89-041

CONTENTS

27 June 1989

PARTY, STATE AFFAIRS

Deputies View Tasks Facing New Congress [Ye.K. Malkova; TRUD, 23 May 89]	1
Law on USSR Citizenship Under Review [Y. Khanga; MOSCOW NEWS, 4-11 Jun 89]	4
Letters to Estonian Supreme Soviet Presidium Analyzed	
[I. Lepp; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 9 Apr 89]	5
Mikk Titma on Estonian Political Developments [M. Titma; SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA, 30 Apr 89]	9
Debate on Brauzauskas Plenum Report Published [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 23 Feb 89]	12
ArSSR First Secretary 23 Feb Discussion with Republic's Intelligentsia	
[S.G. Arutyunyan; KOMMUNIST, 1 Mar 89]	22
Kazakh CP CC Discusses Means to Combat Trade Speculation	
[KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 8 Apr 89]	32
Tajik Buro Discusses Draft Language Law [KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA, 7 Apr 89]	32
Ligachev Tashkent Speech [Ye.K. Ligachev; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 13 May 89]	38
UzSSR: First Secretary Nishanov on Regional Economic Ties	
[R.N. Nishanov; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 14 May 89]	42

RELIGION

Ex-Helsinki-86 Member Founds Catholic Movement [C. Massans; PADOMJU JAUNATNE, 15 Apr 89]	46
Metropolitan Filaret Discusses Church Social, Political Activities [PRAVDA UKRAINY, 16 Apr 89]	47
Komsomol Actors Raise Funds to Restore Church [M. Zakharov; MOSCOW NEWS, 4-11 Jun 89]	50
Writer Supports Return to Morals, Religious Faith [I. Grekova; MOSCOW NEWS, 4-11 Jun 89]	50
Rovno Authorities Block Believers' Attempts To Have Church Returned	
[S. Vlasov; NEDELYA No 20, 15-21 May 89]	53

CULTURE

Draft Charter of USSR Writers' Union Published [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 12, 22 Mar 89]	56
Philosopher Defends Films Labeled 'Pornographic'	
[R. Rykova; ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 19, 13-19 May 89]	63
Director Gives Views of Perestroyka in Theater [E. Lazarev; IZVESTIYA, 11 May 89]	65
Tennis Star's Contract With 'Proserv' Delayed [A. Novikov; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 27 Apr 89]	66
[A. Novikov; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 27 Apr 89]	66
New Complex Proposed for Old Arbat [A. Ritin; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 17 May 89]	67
Librarians Strike State Library for Foreign Literature	
[Ye. Kuzmin; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 17 May 89]	68

SOCIAL ISSUES

Mironenko on Komsomol CC Buro Discussion of Draft Law on Youth	
[V. Mironenko; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 17 May 89]	69
Alienation of Soviet Youth, Corrective Measures Discussed	
[L. Radzikhovskiy; UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA, 28 Mar 89]	74
Crusading Prosecutor Reinstated [L. Nikitinskiy; KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, 19 May 89]	75
Correspondent in Geneva Examines Attitudes Toward Soviet Human Rights Issues	
[M. Maksimov; LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 17 May 89]	78
Legal Scholar Kartashkin on Human Rights [V.A. Kartashkin; TRUD, 31 May 89]	82
'Pamyat' Member Detained in Riga [SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH, 12 May 89]	84
UkSSR OVIR Official Discusses Changes in Emigration Procedures	
[H. Tuhay; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 16 Feb 89]	84
UkSSR Education Official on Restructuring Higher, Secondary Education	
[RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 26 Jan 89]	86

Homebrew Operation Becomes Full-Fledged Business in Uzbekistan [O. Aleksandrov; PRAVDA VOSTOKA, 28 Apr 89]	88
Crime Increase in Uzbekistan Attributed to Alcohol, Narcotics Use [S. Zapolskaya; SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA, 11 Apr 89]	89
Alcohol Treatment, Prevention Centers Deemed Outmoded, Ineffective [A. Kheruvimskiy; SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, 18 Apr 89]	90
Leningrad Red Cross Proposes Soup Kitchens to Feed Hungry [M. Kushnir; SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, 29 Apr 89]	91
Deplorable Living Standards Contribute to High Infant Mortality [SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA, 4 May 89]	92

REGIONAL ISSUES

Kuybyshev Deputies Prepare for Congress [A. Solarev; SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 24 May 89]	95
Lensoviet Creates Inter-Ethnic Commission [LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 12 May 89]	97
Readers Evaluate Newspaper's Coverage [I. Kosenkova; LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA, 12 Feb 89]	97
Currency Exchange Regulations Changed [Yu. Vishnikov; PADOMJU JAUNATNE, 25 Apr 89]	98
Rationale of New Constitution Proposed [R. Stanislovaytis; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 14 Apr 89]	99
Presidium of LiSSK Supreme Soviet Meets [SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 23 Apr 89]	102
Family Insurance Coverage Amended [Y. Berzhinskis; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 29 Apr 89]	103
Joint Enterprise Products Exhibited [A. Pipiras; SOVETSKAYA LITVA, 29 Apr 89]	105
Reader Asserts Children Lack Opportunities to Learn Ukrainian [V. Didenko; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 28 Jan 89]	105
Academician on Eliminating Blank Spots in Ukrainian Economics [P. Leonenko; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 3 Feb 89]	106
Newspaperman Asserts Moldavian Culture Better Attended to Than Ukrainian [I. Herman; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 24 Jan 89]	107
Reader Asks That Ukrainians in Other Parts of USSR Be Remembered [V. Obodnyuk; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 24 Jan 89]	108
Ukrainian Readers Informed of Developments in Estonian Press [V. Desyatnikov; RADYANSKA UKRAYINA, 28 Feb 89]	108
ArSSR Council of Ministers Chairman Markaryants on Priority Tasks [V.S. Markaryants; PRAVITELSTVENNIY VESTNIK No 4, Feb 89]	110
Unauthorized 20 Feb Yerevan Demonstration Reported [KOMMUNIST, 22 Feb 89]	111
Official Report On Dispersion of 8 Mar Yerevan Disturbances [KOMMUNIST, 10 Mar 89]	111
Roundtable With 'Nevada,' 'Green Front' [L. Baydman; KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA, 15 Apr 89]	112
Deputy Interviewed on Work of Group Investigating Tbilisi Events [Ye. Yakovlev; MOLODEZH GRUZII, 20 Apr 89]	120
Tajik Student Teacher Riot Described by Victims; Cause Still Unresolved [M. Lebedev; KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA, 24 Feb 89]	123

Deputies View Tasks Facing New Congress
18001102 Moscow TRUD in Russian 23 May 89 p 2

[Interview with Ye. K. Malkova, foreman at Moscow Workroom No 5 of Factory No 1 of the Siluet Production Association; E. A. Pamfilova, chairman of the trade union committee of the Central Repair and Maintenance Plant of Mosenergo [Moscow Rayon Power-Engineering Administration]; Academician O. T. Bogomolov, director of the Institute of the Economy of the World Socialist System; V. Ye. Kurtashin, general director of the Kriogenmash [Cryogenic Machinery] Research and Production Association; and Doctor of Economic Sciences G. S. Lisichkin, under the rubric "Meeting in the Editorial Offices": "Facing Problems"; interview conducted in TRUD editorial offices in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] In a few days the USSR Congress of People's Deputies will open in Moscow. It will be the first Congress in the context of the reform of the political system that is being carried out in the country. The fortunes of the country will depend on its decisions and its carefully weighed and thought-out judgments. The deputies are arriving for the Congress armed with directives from their constituents, and their firmly expressed will to provide a new impetus for restructuring.

What problems facing society are attracting special attention from the people's deputies, and what decisions do they expect from the Congress? This was the topic of discussion at a meeting of a group of people's deputies held in the editorial offices. Participating in it were Ye. K. Malkova, foreman at Moscow Workroom No 5 of Factory No 1 of the Siluet Production Association; E. A. Pamfilova, chairman of the trade union committee of Mosenergo's Central Repair and Maintenance Plant; Academician O. T. Bogomolov, director of the Institute of the Economy of the World Socialist System; V. Ye. Kurtashin, general director of the Kriogenmash Research and Production Association; and Doctor of Economic Sciences G. S. Lisichkin.

Today we relate the exchange of opinions that took place.

[Bogomolov] I realize that we cannot even touch on here all the questions that the Congress will face. So I shall dwell only on a few. Our constituents, the people, are placing tremendous hopes on the Congress of people's deputies. And our first concern is how to carry out their directives and how to justify those hopes. What can the Congress do? Unfortunately, we have no experience in parliamentary activity. Yet what is intended is the existence of what amounts to two bodies of authority in the parliament: a Congress, which is a very large body and therefore not very capable of making short-term decisions, and a professional legislative body that is rather narrow, and generally accountable to the Congress; that will be the Supreme Soviet. Right now we are deputies to the Congress. And what rights will we possess? What will we be able to do and demand, and what problems will we be able to raise? All these are seemingly procedural

questions but are actually questions concerning the organization of government in the country. In my opinion, one contradiction is that the Congress has been declared to be the supreme body of state authority, and it adopts the laws. But laws are also adopted by the Supreme Soviet, that is, by the 542 people who will be elected to it.

Many of us today are concerned about how to find the organizational forms that will permit the tremendous political potential of the people's deputies to be utilized. I do not know whether there will be many who are ready to cease being a steel worker, stage performer, major physician, or active scientist for the sake of parliamentary work. And if that is the case, will the Supreme Soviet largely consist of those same apparatus employees who have occupied other positions up until now? The idea is to keep there from being "two grades" of people's deputies: one grade that is part of the Supreme Soviet, and the other that is not. Everyone is a people's deputy, with equal rights.

[Malkova] It cannot be otherwise. In general, attempts to divide up deputies—say, from territories or public organizations—according to some sort of arbitrary "scale of quality" are absolutely improper.

[Bogomolov] And in order to prevent that, we ought to establish Congress bodies, committees on the most important state issues (perhaps instead of Supreme Soviet committees) that could operate on a permanent basis, convene for a relatively short time, include people with immense political and civic potential, and make the greatest possible use of their knowledge and capabilities without taking them entirely away from their basic occupations. And then each deputy might find a job for himself on one of these committees, do regular work, raise questions, and participate in the drafting of laws. Otherwise, what happens? The Congress meets once a year, votes, and that is all. If that is the case, I will not be able to justify my constituents' confidence.

[Kurtashin] What sort of questions should be discussed at the Congress? Well, first of all, the state budget. At present that is a closed area. Even some ministers say that they know nothing about budget matters. Yet the deputies should know everything. For example, there are plans to build a petroleum and gas complex in Tyumen that will cost 50 billion rubles or more. Why? In order to then ship raw material abroad? That is completely unwarranted wastefulness. And what do the deputies of our Supreme Soviet, which is now already giving up its powers, think about this? The Congress of People's Deputies should know where money is going: how much for defense, how much for aid to other countries. The budget must be strictly examined. And especially construction. After all, what is the practice in our country? If there is not enough of some sort of product, how does a minister react? A new plant must be built. But it takes 10 years to build a plant. And he has used that to protect

himself: I'll have a plant built, and I'll solve the problem. And money is wasted, and the amount of unfinished construction work is increased.

[Pamfilova] I believe that we are obliged to take a very informed and intelligent approach to the formation of the cabinet of ministers. It may be that we should drastically reduce the number of ministers and restructure the management of the national economy, otherwise we will still have an immense managerial apparatus with a good many people who are being fed at the expense of labor collectives and yet do nothing useful at all. To the contrary, the swollen bureaucracy has no need for any restructuring in the economic sphere, much less a radical one.

You know what especially disturbs me? It is true that people are expecting a great deal from the Congress. And it will probably disappoint some of them in some respects. Because it will be impossible during the time the Congress is in session to solve the huge number of anguishing problems that presently face society. Yet to single out what is most important and unite on what is most important in order to extricate the country from its grave situation is very important.

But in addition to the strategic problems, certain painful social problems ought to find a solution right now. They are reflected in our trade unions' election platform. They include the pension question, low-income people and families, and pricing policy. They must be solved, in part, by reallocating the budget. For example, Gosplan is proposing to reduce prolonged construction projects by 7-8 billion rubles. Yet scientists say that they could be painlessly reduced by 40 billion rubles. There are some reserves. And what about reduction of the managerial apparatus? Take the structure of our ministry as just one example: it has been cut and cut again, yet the apparatus has grown.

[Malkova] Moreover, we talk about independence, yet the structure of the managerial apparatus as it presently exists provides no possibility of being independent. Take our branch, for example. We speak of a two-level or, at the maximum, three-level management system. Yet a four-level and even five-level management system has been created in our branch. Take a look. A store, a cafeteria, a workroom—that is the first management level, since they all have executives, managers or shift foremen. The next level consists of the enterprises, which combine several of those cafeterias and several small stores and workrooms. The third level is the association, which gives orders to those enterprises. The fourth level consists of the main administrations, and the fifth is the ministry.

I went into a store and, as a deputy, spoke with the manager. She said to me: "Tell me, why do I need that main administration? Every day I take documents home in order to write reports. Yet I myself know how many workers I need, and how much to pay them. I do not

need a structure handed down from above; I myself can manage the funds and give more to the city budget, which would benefit from that. But I am given no opportunity to do so. The rayon administration demands payments, and the association demands them. The ministry does too—and it is the one that develops the strategy for the services sector."

[Bogomolov] Why should the ministry develop the "strategy" for the services sector? Every workroom can do that.

[Malkova] That's what I think, too. Sensible members of cooperatives define that same "strategy" without any sort of red tape. Every employee, including an enterprise director, an economist, or a minister, ought to be directly answerable for the results of his work. They it would be clear to everyone: if a person does not produce, that means he should go.

[Pamfilova] I read in the press that in other countries a code of honor exists. I liked that a lot. If a minister, say, fails in his job, he resigns. And that is not just the moral aspect; that's a principled evaluation of his performance.

[Kurtashin] You get the impression that the network of the bureaucratic apparatus often provides no possibility for people at the local level to implement the ideas of restructuring. It lets nothing get by. And it won't let it. Because the bureaucrats are taking a wait-and-see position: what will happen, and will I be occupying my chair?

I believe that the ministries right now are to all intents and purposes doing nothing. If they are to be eliminated, people need to be told so definitely. It is impossible to drag out restructuring and the reorganization of industrial management this way. In my view, we must preserve a minimum apparatus, completely eliminate 25-30 percent of the ministries, and the rest, perhaps, reduce by half.

[Bogomolov] Yes, the voters are right when they stress that we need fewer people who do nothing but manage things. Yet at the present time agriculture alone has more managers than the United States has farmers, who feed the entire country.

[Lisichkin] I would like to say something about agriculture in particular. And here is why. For decades we have been investing immense amounts of money in it, but we are not getting a return. And I think that is primarily because we invest money but do not know what we are investing it in and do not consult the peasants. Our entire policy in the area of agriculture, I would say, is "to protect the weak." A person does not know how to work, and we give him money, machinery, fertilizer, loans, etc. But we have to recognize that if we want to get results we have to set up a different chain: people-technology, and only after that come capital investments.

The way people figure it in our country is that if you build a livestock section, all questions have been resolved; or you set up a machinery pool, and results are ensured. Yet that is not the case. There may be a livestock section but poor livestock, or there may be livestock but no feed. We invest money, but with no results. And no matter how much machinery, fertilizer, and mixed feed we provide the place with, the results are the same: zero or negative results.

[Kurtashin] The countryside is our pain, the whole country's pain. We have destroyed agriculture and destroyed the peasantry. But what is the situation right now? We cannot drag anyone into the peasantry. We build homes, but no one goes. I traveled throughout Tula, Ryazan and Tambov oblasts: new cottages have been built there, but no one is hurrying to occupy them.

[Lisichkin] I would like to read a letter from Lvov Oblast from S. Orlyuk, deputy secretary of the party committee on the Progress Kolkhoz. "I read the CPSU Central Committee's May Day appeals, and I immediately came to a stop: 'Long live the working class, our society's leading force!' Well, what about the other part of our society—the peasantry, say, to which we are presently promising to repay our debts? What are they supposed to do—continue to go around with an inferiority complex and look with envy on the leader?" I want to support Orlyuk, because the inequitable position of the peasantry is encoded, if one may put it that way, in economic policy. I want to call attention right now to parity of prices, which reflects that inequality. Just look. In order to acquire 1,000 bricks, a farm in Stavropol Oblast has to sell the state 350 kg of meat or 6.5 quintals of wheat. A Kirovets tractor "costs" 8 tons of meat or 140-145 tons of grain. A Niva combine costs 4 tons of meat or 70-72 tons of grain.

We say that the production of meat is unprofitable in our country, and now potato production is too. How could it be profitable with such prices? And why do we put our industry in such a privileged position? No matter what it makes—a combine, a tractor, or poor-quality mixed feed—its production will still be highly profitable in terms of the plan. And all the money that is allocated to agriculture will in one way or another be returned to industry. That is an abnormal situation. That needs to be talked about bluntly from the Congress rostrum.

[Kurtashin] I want to add something. The situation with respect to the storage of agricultural products is absolutely terrible. There has been a decision, but no one is dealing with this problem. A miserable percentage of vegetables and fruits are stored in a regulated, gaseous environment. That is paradoxical. The equipment exists: capitalists from Australia buy it from us. But in our own country we cannot solve the problem. I have been around to all the offices—I have appealed to the Moscow Obkom, to the Ministry of Installation and Special Construction Work, and to the deputy minister. Warehouses of this sort must be set up. So far there is only an

agreement to do so by 1991. If we introduce the storage of agricultural products at such a pace, we will lose 30-40 percent of what is grown. Industry would also seem to be to blame, but I would say blamelessly to blame.

And sense we have started talking about industry—one more question. We pay little attention to the growth in labor productivity. Yet our whole economy depends on it. I am concerned by attitudes of dependency. Take a look at how conferences and sessions of councils of labor collectives have been going lately. Everyone says only "Give!" "Give us a swimming pool; give us an apartment; build something; increase women's leave. But no one thinks about how to increase profits. And without that, there will be neither pensions nor swimming pools. We talk about self-financing and say we have made the transition to the second model. But all that is in some respects pro forma. Until workers genuinely run the enterprises, and until everyone knows that he will receive a certain share of the profits, labor productivity will not grow.

[Bogomolov] When we speak of a proprietary attitude toward business, it is appropriate to recall cooperatives. They are presently drawing a lot of criticism—both for their prices for products, and for their wages. It is true that speculation and all sorts of other things take place. But we have a good many industrial and construction cooperatives that have been performing well.

[Kurtashin] Very few.

[Bogomolov] No, according to the statistics I have, they probably make up 60-70 percent of the total number of cooperatives. Of course, wages account for a higher percentage of their output than they do at enterprises. But the intensiveness of their work is higher.

We need cooperatives. But we launched this movement without laying the most elementary groundwork. We adopted a fairly decent Law on Cooperatives. But we made no provisions for a financial auditing system, without which cooperatives' activity can lead to abuses. No tax system was worked out, either. That, of course, immediately created a mass of distortions. And, of course, questions of quality control were not raised at all. Throughout the whole world a strict system exists: in some places, since the Middle Ages, in order to become a brewer and be allowed to join a brewers' shop, one has had to pass a strict examination. Yet in our country if someone wants to make garments, he is welcome to do so.

Furthermore, we practically pushed cooperatives onto a path of all sorts of illegal operations and speculation by depriving them of legal rights to be supplied. Although the Law on Cooperatives and all of our ideology proceed from the premise that there are not supposed to be two types of ownership in our country, and that cooperatives are also socialist ownership, in practice they are placed in inequitable conditions. And consequently we have

compromised the movement. All this should receive attention from the new parliament. In my view, we should give the branches of light industry and the food industry, and the services sector the same freedom that cooperatives have, preserving only one control—over prices. After all, we have first-rate factories where we pay a worker 150 rubles for good output. Yet a cooperative member receives 2,000 for doing the same thing. Why can't we grant the same rights to garment and textile mills and to many workshops? Go ahead and cut your personnel, and if you want to earn 2,000, work well.

[Pamfilova] Evidently, cooperatives might also work in heavy industry, might they not?

[Bogomolov] Here I would not hurry. Because a sharp rise in earnings in the branches that produce consumer goods does not threaten to create inflation. They have already produced a product that has gone onto the market.

[Pamfilova] The word trade unions should be spoken firmly in the Congress. They should develop a fully independent position and not share with economic managers responsibility for labor productivity, the level of technology and plan fulfillment; they should, first and foremost, protect the working people's social interests and present the government with demands connected with wages, low-income families, the living standard, inflation, and other "sore points." Otherwise you get total irresponsibility: everyone—both the economic managers and the trade unions—is responsible for everything. And if that is the case, in essence no one is responsible.

The trade unions have let the questions of price control slip away. At some enterprises strikes have been taking place, and the trade unions are in confusion and, to all intents and purposes, have no position. Yet we should be able to foresee and master the situation, and in order to do that, we should have exhaustive sources of information.

[Malkova] I shall touch on a more general question—labor collectives and the rights of the collective and the enterprise. To all intents and purposes, the Law on the Enterprise is not working, and it will not work until we finally get rid of command methods. Let us not forget: in the final analysis the fortunes of restructuring will be decided in the labor collectives, where items of material value are created and where the person who possesses vocational experience, knowledge and a civic stance is reared. If we are able to liberate the economy and instill in people a proprietary attitude toward their business, then we will be victorious. That is the attitude with which we are going to the Congress.

The deputies spoke ardently and with concern about the country's affairs and the fortunes of restructuring. Of course, as Academician O. Bogomolov emphasized at the

very outset, the discussion could not cover all the problems. But it outlined certain key points. And, in addition to everything else, it attested to the active stance of the people's deputies and to their desire and readiness to discuss and work to resolve all of the most pressing, most complex questions that life has raised.

Law on USSR Citizenship Under Review

18120101 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 22, 4-11 Jun 89 p 5

[Interview with Anatoly Kovler, department head at the Institute of State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences by Yelena Khanga]

[Text] "The new law (the current law was introduced in 1978) has been worked on by a team of legal scientists and representatives from law-making bodies with the cooperation of experts from the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Their task is to see that the draft law should be in accord with existing international laws.

"For example, Article 18 of the current law is in contradiction with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. That article states that a 'person may be stripped of his or her USSR citizenship only by way of exception and through a decision of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, following his or her actions which dishonour the distinguished title of a Soviet citizen and injure the USSR's prestige or security.' However, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights proclaims (Article 15, Par. 2) that 'no one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his/her nationality nor denied the right to change his/her nationality'. Undoubtedly, this legal norm will be needed in the process of designing the new law.

"In the current law there is a point which is clearly outdated. It dismisses the possibility of dual citizenship, although in fact it exists. Soviet consulates in certain West European countries and in the Near East grant Soviet passports to persons already possessing passports issued in the country of their residence, especially in cases of multinationality marriages."

Question: To elect and be elected is one of the most important civil rights. For the first time, our compatriots residing abroad were given the chance to participate in the elections of people's deputies of the USSR.

Answer: This is a long stride forward, undoubtedly. Yet few people could actually use the possibility due to the poor work methods of the Soviet consular staff. According to the returns of a special quick poll, only one or two per cent of Soviet citizens abroad took part in the elections. Polling stations were set up in almost 50 countries, but voter lists were mainly made up of the staff of Soviet organizations operating in those countries, and other people were not properly informed about their voting rights.

Question: Lots of Soviet women who have once married foreign subjects now want to return to the USSR, for various reasons. Do they find it easy to return?

Answer: Judge for yourself. Lyudmila Ch., a Soviet citizen, spent 23 years in the Sudan living with her husband. She was a senior lecturer at the university where she taught Russian. Now, after the death of her husband, she dearly wishes to return. A Moscow cousin is willing to share her residence with Lyudmila. However, the Moscow authorities disagree to give their consent to that, because Lyudmila is not gainfully employed in Moscow. Yet, she cannot get a job here because she has no Moscow residence permit. Obviously this is a vicious circle.

Soviet women often find their rights denied. Widows can claim nothing of their late husband's property in the majority of developing countries. Neither can they claim alimony after divorce when they leave for the USSR. Their work abroad is not included in their employment record. These women should be legally guaranteed social protection. That should be specifically stipulated by Soviet law.

Question: How many foreigners have come to the USSR to live here?

Answer: To a certain extent this information is classified in this country. According to foreign sources, over 500,000 people have left the USSR and about 300,000 (mainly former Soviet emigrants) have come here since World War II.

Question: Is the new law going to be based on different principles in the matter of conferring USSR citizenship?

Answer: The draft law envisages a more flexible and precise procedure for conferring USSR citizenship on foreigners, as well as for the withdrawal or regaining of USSR citizenship.

Last year, several hundred former Soviets returned to the USSR from various countries. Almost all of them had to face formidable economic problems. For example, they had had jobs and an abode before they left the USSR. But they've lost them. Now the state has to provide them jobs and new lodging. However, the task is rather difficult. It might be a good idea to have a relief fund for repatriates. Of course, those Soviets who have never left the country and still have to live in inferior flats may protest: "Why should the repatriates be taken care of when there are people in the country who still lack good flats?" That may be a fair complaint. Yet the repatriates in becoming Soviet, are entitled to all the rights granted by our Constitution.

Emigrants of the first and the second waves of emigration who wish they could live the rest of their lives in the USSR, contact Rodina, the society for cultural relations with compatriots abroad, and propose that they be

allowed to have boarding houses built for them (with their own money) in Central Russia and have a room or a flat there. Such proposals are currently being studied.

Question: There's also a number of problems connected with foreigners who come to the USSR to work.

Answer: You are right. Once I happened to guide a group of young French unemployed people to the Baikal-Amur Railway project. Having worked for one month there they were so happy that they wished they could remain for several years more. I had to explain to them that they couldn't stay if they had no adequately serious reasons for staying.

At the Karakumstroi Turkmenian civil engineering department headquarters I was told that several dozen truck drivers, never mind their nationality, would be welcomed there and offered housing to boot.

If the country lacks work force in some areas and if there are foreigners who agree to be paid in roubles, not in hard currency, for working in tough conditions, then why shouldn't we offer them that opportunity? I think that this should also be allowed in the new Law on USSR Citizenship. By the way, I believe that Soviets able to go abroad to work there as specialists should have that right as well. Incidentally, that right has been provided in a number of international covenants.

Letters to Estonian Supreme Soviet Presidium Analyzed

18001007 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 9 Apr 89 p 3

[Article by I. Lepp, head of the Reception Room of the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet: "The People State Their Opinion"]

[Text] On 31 March, a session of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian SSR summed up the results of examination and resolution of petitions, proposals, and demands submitted by citizens, public movements, organizations, labor collectives, and soviets of people's deputies to the Presidium during 1988 and the first quarter of 1989.

The population of our republic demonstrated unprecedented activeness in 1988 in discussing socio-political and economic problems and in making proposals on questions on the agenda.

During last year, the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet received a total of 40,760 collective letters, minutes and resolutions of meetings, sessions, and rallies, and also statements of citizens. In 1987, it received 1,614.

Most of the appeals were during the discussion of the draft law on additions and changes to the USSR Constitution and the draft law on elections of USSR people's

deputies, that is, before the special session of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet on 18 November 1988. The Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet received 25,583 letters, minutes, resolutions, and decrees on these issues. The majority of the letters were collective letters with tens and hundreds of signatures. Two-thirds of the population of our republic expressed their opinion on these draft laws.

Appeals with proposals on recognizing Estonian as a state language came in second in number, with 11,625 letters, minutes and resolutions of meetings received. Passage of the Law on Language was supported not only by Estonians, but also a fairly significant portion of representatives of other nationalities living in our republic. But there were also letters that objected to passage of the Law on Language or the demands to amend this draft, and also the recognition of the Estonian and Russian languages as state languages or recognition of the Russian language as the language of interethnic communication. But the number of letters of this sort was not very large.

After passage of the Estonian SSR Law on Language, we began receiving letters containing opinions on this law. These letters also came in from the RSFSR and other union republics. Some of the letters approved of the Law on Language, others denounced it. But those people who support the right of nations to self-determination and the need to protect and develop national languages and cultures welcome the passage of the Law on Language and express the opinion that all union republics should follow suit. We received letters of this sort from the Ukraine, Belorussia, Latvia, Lithuania, and so forth.

In addition to the above, citizens also touched upon the following socio-political issues in their letters:

- passage of a Estonian SSR law on citizenship and putting an end to migration;
- creation of a sovereign and cost-accounting Estonia;
- approval of a national flag, national symbol, and also a national anthem of the Estonian SSR;
- rehabilitation of people deported and subjected to non-judicial repression and compensation for damages from confiscation of property;
- a ban on mining of phosphorites;
- the inapplicability in our republic of USSR laws on rallies, meetings, and demonstrations;
- establishment of a time zone;
- expression of distrust of certain top-level officials in the republic;
- creation of Estonian territorial military units;

—improvement of the working and living conditions of reservists from our republic working at Chernobyl.

Some of these sore points have already been eliminated or are being eliminated. We received more than 600 letters supporting and recognizing successful solutions. The people are awaiting resolution of the remaining issues from the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet, its Presidium, the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers, and other bodies.

There were somewhat more appeals in 1988 from citizens to the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet with personal concerns or on issues of local importance than there were in the preceding year. There were 1,693 of this sort received in 1988, and 1,609 received in 1987. The number of petitions for rehabilitation increased significantly. There were 84 received in 1988, while there were 8 in 1987. Applications for rehabilitation increased following M.S. Gorbachev's statement at the grand session of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet on 2 November 1987 that restoration, suspended in 1960, of the rights of citizens repressed without reason during the cult of personality should continue.

We now have the Law "On Non-Judicial Mass Repressions in Soviet Estonia between 1940 and 1950," passed by the USSR Supreme Soviet on 7 December 1988. Based on this law, all citizens expelled from Soviet Estonia between 1940 and 1950 have been rehabilitated. We also have the 1 January 1989 Ukase of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the rehabilitation of citizens who were subjected to non-judicial repressions. In their applications, citizens usually petition both for rehabilitation and for the return of or compensation for property confiscated. Since the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers passed a resolution on 20 February 1989 on the procedure for returning property and compensating for damage to victims of mass repressions, this problem is being resolved now, too.

The ispolkoms of Tallinn, Tartu, and certain other cities and rayons have established additional restrictions on residence permits for citizens arriving from outside the republic in order to halt migration. As a result, the migratory balance in Tallinn was cut almost in half in 1988 compared to 1987. In 1988, the migratory balance was 2,149 people, compared to 4,307 in 1987. During the first months of 1989, Tallinn had a negative migratory balance for the first time in many decades. This attests to the effectiveness of the measures taken by the Tallinn Gorkom and its ispolkom. Certain other cities and rayons in the republic have also begun to implement measures to block migration.

The number of applications to emigrate from the USSR and to visit relatives or friends living abroad continues to be great. There were 137 such applications in 1987,

and 136 in 1987. Some of them are collective applications and contain a petition to leave the USSR for religion reasons (Christians of the Evangelical faith, Buddhists, and members of the "Word of Life"). They substantiate their desire to emigrate by the fact that in our state they lack the opportunity to propagandize their faith, teach their children the word of God, obtain religious literature, or to improve in the field of theology. There were 17 applications received from citizens petitioning for authorization to leave and to give up USSR citizenship because they do not like our system and the poor living conditions. They want to emigrate to Sweden, Israel, or do not indicate where, but the main thing is that they just want to leave. Some of the applications petition for authorization to visit relatives or friends and contain requests for an explanation of the procedures for completing the paperwork for this. Documents for leaving the USSR and the decision associated with these issues are handled in our republic by the Estonian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs. Beginning last year, the procedure for filing travel documents has been simplified considerably, and it is easier to obtain permission to leave. Thus, a large portion of the corresponding petitions are now being satisfied.

The number of applications on questions of public health and social security, trade and public catering, education, transportation, and municipal services has increased, but especially those on social and political questions.

We received 16 applications on questions of public health. A meeting of Pyarnu physicians are petitioning to step up the pace of construction of a new hospital in Pyarnu. Patients of the Kokhtla-Yarve Dermatological and Venerological Clinic denounce the unsanitary conditions that prevail in the clinic in their collective petition. The collective statement, containing 40 signatures, to leave the veterans' hospital at Seli subordinate to the republic. A citizen of Toomsalu, on behalf of patients at the Pyarnu Hospital, expressed outrage at the shortage of medicines. Each statement raises some special issue. As a rule, they are sent to the Estonian SSR Ministry of Health for resolution.

There were 70 appeals on questions of social security. Citizens request assistance on recalculating pensions, granting personal pensions, providing material assistance, including imprisonment time in labor service, granting handicapped vehicles, and so forth. These applications are sent to the Estonian SSR Ministry of Social Security or to the appropriate ispolkom.

There were 51 appeals on questions of trade and public catering. In 7 of them, large families petitioned for permission to purchase either a minibus or a Volga pickup; 28 citizens petitioned for permission to purchase a motor vehicle; and 1 expressed concern with the way

rural population is being supplied with food products. The remaining 15 contained complaints about the behavior of waiters, violation of trade rules, and other negative phenomena.

There were 28 statements on national education issues, and 55 on various questions of transportation and municipal services. They are under jurisdiction of either the appropriate ministry or ispolkom.

The number of appeals on questions of housing, agriculture, communications, environmental protection, consumer services, awards, and clemency has decreased.

There were 424 appeals on housing issues this year, and 595 in 1987. Whereas the number of housing appeals ranked first for many years, in 1988 there were more on questions of law and order—478.

In 1988, 489 citizens visited the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet.

Citizens consulted city, rayon, village and rural ispolkoms of the Estonian SSR 43,465 times: 21,433 in writing and 22,032 orally. In 1987, these figures were 54,857 and 23,871, respectively.

In the first quarter of 1989, the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet received 799 appeals from citizens, minutes, and resolutions. More than half of them, 430, concerned social and political questions. The people continue to actively make proposals and advance demands on still-unresolved problems. Authors of the more than 45 letters already received this year, many of them collective letters, support passage of the Estonian SSR Law on Citizenship and make suggestions on the content of this law. The authors of the letters are most interested in who will become a citizen of the Estonian SSR. The statements supporting the establishment of citizenship still do not have unanimity or distinct opinion on the conditions for obtaining Estonian SSR citizenship. But the authors of virtually all letters favor passage of the law on citizenship. O. Rakovskiy, a resident of Tallinn, bases his proposal on the need for passage of the law on the fact that the absence of such a law has led to a situation in which people are running for the office of USSR people's deputy who have not lived in the republic very long and are not at all able to represent the interests of the native population. Many of the statements support the point of view stated in the letter from the Popular Front support group of Pydrangu Sovkhoz: "We should pass a law on citizenship that would ensure that priority is given to native residents in resolving issues of the economy and social policy."

The draft law on citizenship is nearing completion, and the time is not far off when it will be submitted to the people for discussion and then for passage.

The 21 March 1988 Ukase of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet on taxation of owners of means of transport and other self-propelled vehicles and machines; based on it, beginning this year, the tax on means of transport has increased significantly, and it should be recalculated into the USSR budget for construction and modernization of roads in the RSFSR. According to forecasts of the Estonian SSR Ministry of Finance, this sum will be approximately 5 million rubles from residents of the Estonian SSR and 15 million rubles from enterprises, institutions, and organizations a year, for a total of 20 million rubles. The 32 collective letters with 2,132 signatures argue that the roads in Estonia are also in poor condition and that this money should be used entirely for putting them in order and building new roads. The letters petition the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers, in accordance with the 16 November 1988 declaration on sovereignty, to speak out against the arbitrary actions by the central authority.

For the second time now, the United Council of Labor Collectives [OSTK] and Intermovement are evoking the dissatisfaction and protest of many labor collectives by their appeals and resolutions adopted at meetings and rallies.

The first wave of protest came in mid-November of last year, when the OSTK and Intermovement called upon the deputies of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet to vote at the special session against the amendments to the Estonian SSR Constitution, the Law on Language, and the program of republic cost-accounting being discussed. In response to these appeals to hold rallies on 15 November 1988 in labor collectives to support these demands, 400 collectives sent to the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet minutes, resolutions, and decisions of their meetings or simply letters, in which they denounce the activities of the OSTK and Intermovement aimed at splitting the residents of Estonia, express support for the positions of the 11th Central Committee Plenum of the Communist Party of Estonia and the activities of the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet, and express confidence in Vayno Vyalyas, Arnold Ryutel, and Indrek Toome.

A new wave of protest was caused by the speeches and decisions at Intermovement's first congress in Tallinn on 4-5 March and at a rally at the Tallinn City Hall on 14 March, organized by Intermovement and the OSTK. As of 28 March, the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet had received 329 collective letters, decisions and resolutions, meetings of labor collectives, statements, and so forth, which denounce the ultimatums and slanderous accusations made at the above measures against the Estonian people and the leaders of the republic, as well as attempts to speak on behalf of the entire working class of Estonia. These appeals express support for the leadership of the republic and demand a stop to the activities of Intermovement, strike committees, and the OSTK.

Many of the letters sent to the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet express gratitude for proclaiming 24 February Independence Day and for raising the blue, black and white national flag on Dlinny German Tower. Other opinions are also stated. For example, certain structural subdivisions of labor collectives of the Estonian State Regional Electric Power Plant, the Estrybrom Association and the Estonian Maritime Steamship Line, and also the Tallinn Council of Party Veterans believed that replacing the state flag with the national flag on Dlinny German Tower was a political mistake and an anti-Soviet provocation.

Dozens of letters express support for the Union of Labor Collectives and the Popular Front. A resolution of the Third Plenum of the Pylva Party Raykom petitions to make public N.S. Khrushchev's report at the 20th CPSU Congress on opening archives, reconsidering sentences from the times of Stalinism, and so forth. The Valgaskiy Rayon Soviet adopted a decision on 14 February in which it proposes establishing Estonian SSR citizenship, putting an end to importing manpower, banning the sale of homes to citizens of other union republics, and halting the exchange of apartments outside the Estonian SSR and residency permits for service members retired in the republic. Members of the Tammsaare Branch of the Estonian Society for Protection of Nature got 1,585 signatures to raise again the question of phosphorites and demand that republic's supreme organ of power not authorize mining of phosphorites in the area of Toolse and Rakvere.

An analysis of the letters and statements received shows that, under conditions of perestroika and glasnost, citizens are devoting serious attention to the problems being resolved for the future of our republic and people. But the people's day-to-day concerns are not disappearing, and if something is not resolved in an timely manner or if a decision, explanation or negative response from the ispolkom of the local soviet, enterprise, institution or organization, ministry, and so forth does not satisfy a citizen, he usually appeals to a higher body, hoping for a favorable decision. In most cases, these appeals are not justified because the real capabilities and existing procedures have already been taken into account at the initial stage of resolving the issue. But in individual cases, such appeals nevertheless have speed up resolution of the matter in favor of the citizen or determination of a fundamentally new decision.

The population of the republic played a decisive role in preparing the acts adopted at the November-December 1988 and January 1989 sessions of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet.

During summation of results, the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet expressed gratitude to all citizens, public organizations and movements, and also labor collectives who with their proposals and support contributed to the passage of just legislative acts that earned the approval of the people. Those proposals that

have not been used are on record in the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet and will be considered by the working groups and commissions created for this purpose.

The hours citizens are received at the Reception Room of the Presidium of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet have been approved: 15:00-19:00 Monday; 10:00-13:00 and 15:00-19:00 Wednesdays; 10:00-13:00 and 15:00-18:00 Fridays.

Mikk Titma on Estonian Political Developments
18001146 Tallinn SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA in Russian 30 Apr 89 p 2

[Interview with Mikk Titma, secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, conducted by correspondent G. Rozenshteyn: "In Politics Responsibility Is the Most Important Thing"; date and place of interview not specified]

[Text] Mikk Titma, secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, answers SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA's questions.

[Correspondent] The press, radio and television are frequently criticized for creating an unhealthy atmosphere in the republic. What is your attitude toward such statements?

[Titma] I think this is a case in which the subjective element obscures actual processes. That is expressed in a concentrated form in the general claim that the mass news media are creating an unhealthy atmosphere. The idea here is that if they did not arouse the people, life would follow the norm. Yet we are adults and know perfectly well that real life by no means follows the norm, that life is full of contradictions and conflicts among interests, which, as they say, sometimes occur. One must see both the interests and these people and correctly evaluate them.

[Correspondent] In their letters readers express disagreement with some ideas you expressed in your 22 February SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA interview this year. Do you still hold to your previous positions?

[Titma] I understand what you are talking about. The priority of the Estonian nation is the first thing. I consider that position fundamental, and I was not the first one to state that. That is not just the position of the Estonian intelligentsia, as some people try to claim; that position is also expressed unequivocally in Marxism. Specifically, it is this: in a national republic, on the territory where a nation lives, its priority in comparison to the representatives of other nations is unconditional. It is expressed in the fact that for it that territory is the only place in the world for it to live as a nation. And its word should be decisive there. **Precisely its word as a nation.** I think that since the publication of a very thoroughgoing article in VECHEARNY TALLINN (20

April, 1989) there is no point in getting into this problem in greater detail. Even in the most distressing times of Stalinism that view was not openly denied. Never. Of course, in practice it was treated as a purely formal matter, but in words it was enthusiastically asserted that the nation's word on its territory was decisive. So there is no revelation in my position; it is represented by all Marxists from Lenin and Stalin up to our day. My opponents have resorted to a superficially effective trick: in place of nation they have started to talk about people, about specific individuals. It comes out that Titma is saying that an Estonian should have priority over a Russian, Ukrainian or, say, Tatar, although I stated unambiguously in my SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA interview that the priority of the nation absolutely does not mean the priority of the individual. One can debate me and disagree with me and level political accusations. But if the first secretary of the Central Committee or any secretary of our Central Committee started to dispute that approach, he, to all intents and purposes, could not carry on any discussion with Estonians. Because he would be going against the objective process of the restoration of national consciousness and the general revival of the nation on its own territory. That is too basic an issue to be played games with by any leader who wants to work with the Estonian population.

The second thing is my viewpoint on consolidation. PRAVDA wrote about it disapprovingly. The principle of consolidation has meaning only when there is a general basis for consolidation, and when there is the possibility of dialogue. "But how can one attempt to find a common language with the Stalinists, who deny, in general, that Estonia is a national republic?" That crude sentence is ascribed to me, but I actually wrote something else: there can be no consolidation with people who deny that the ESSR is a sovereign republic. If they do not like it in the republic, they can leave and go where they will feel normal and have the possibility of working in a politically active fashion to introduce their views. I repeat: consolidation is possible only if there is a common platform. All national groups in Estonia should consolidate, and there can be no discrimination here. It is simply unthinkable. And so should all regions of Estonia, regardless of which nationality prevails there. That is my position. But as for an unprincipled consolidation that is purely a slogan—who does it make feel better?

[Correspondent] What do you think: isn't a process of the dehumanization of society taking place today? Crime is on the rise, and there is a lot of malice and envy in people.

[Titma] I believe that the false humanism of the stagnation period is worse even than the sometimes offensive but sincere behavior that breaks out today on public squares and in auditoriums. We have started to speak realistically about real processes and diverse interests. Such interests, of course, existed before, but today they have been set into motion and are sharply clashing. And

as for the fact that this is often expressed in an unusually harsh form—Humanism and culture presuppose tolerance. I got into an argument with a certain editor. He was claiming that Estonian problems receive inadequate treatment in the Russian newspapers. I asked him to what extent the problems of the Russian-speaking population are represented in his newspaper.

Humanism, democratization and culture are being born in a painful process in our country. That is normal; there is nothing out of the ordinary here. Lately wounded people have also come out to center stage, and they are expressing their feelings of offense with great anger and pomp. This sort of thing can be seen in politics, journalism and all other spheres. It is a disease of growth, and we should endure it. But I disagree in principle with the notion that relations in our society are being dehumanized. I think that it is precisely humanism that is being born today, but the birth is proceeding painfully and with difficulty.

[Correspondent] A great deal is being said and written at the present time about a multiparty system. What is your forecast here?

[Titma] The problem of a multiparty system is one that will be solved elsewhere than in Estonia. In principle, I do not see anything seditious about putting the matter that way. Although I understand that the problem can be solved by giving room to public movements in politics. Naturally, the interests of the peasants workers and intelligentsia, including those of national groups, should be represented in politics. In what form? Right now we are encouraging public movements and trying, through them, to represent these diverse interests and take them into account in politics. And, on this basis, to create pluralism of opinions. After all, an opinion that has been expressed in the newspaper or on radio and become available to the public is not just someone's opinion but expresses interests that actually exist in society. They always existed, but for a long time we brushed them aside, like a bothersome fly. And now they must be openly and publicly expressed and in some way combined on the basis of political compromises and the actual political process. Inasmuch as public movements are very diverse, there is a great deal that is subjective in them, since the leader puts his imprint on a movement, and it is very difficult to shake out all these contradictions and stabilize politics in such a small republic as Estonia. Sometimes complaints are leveled against us that we do not react, do not eliminate, do not punish, etc. We deliberately do not do so, because if we were to react hastily to every push to the right or left, we could not make policy in a responsible fashion. And in politics responsibility is the most important thing. It is impossible to take any screamer who comes along seriously and start debating with him! One must treat such incidents calmly and maintain calm. It is precisely tolerance—patience and tolerance—that helped us create a situation in Estonia that, in my opinion, is better than in our neighboring republics. And if we continue to make

policy in an intelligent and calm fashion, we will achieve real results in restructuring more quickly. The example of Georgia is instructive for us. The Georgian leadership made a huge mistake—it saw only the rebellious part of the population, but did not see all of Georgia. And it entered into a confrontation with that small part without realizing that there was also a greater Georgia that could be included in the dialogue.

Now an example from our life. In March there were extremist demonstrations plainly calculated to cause the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee to lose control of itself. We allowed that process to develop, and today there is a possibility of conducting a calm dialogue with those people and their leaders. And at the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee's plenum in early May it will be possible to continue the discussion of their interests and incorporate those interests in policy.

Another example. Although only 10 citizen committees have been established in the republic and most of those are in one rayon, we saw a potential danger in them. If that movement started spreading throughout Estonia, we would, to all intents and purposes, lose control of the situation. In that case it was necessary to react very promptly. And to react in such a way that Estonians would realize what was really up. After all, the ordinary Estonian thinks that these committees represent his interests. And he would spontaneously take the path suggested by these committees. And the Central Committee did react quickly. It is said that politics is the art of the possible. But one must be capable of moving quickly, and calm.

[Correspondent] Could you talk in greater detail about who has been organizing those citizen committees?

[Titma] In the elections the tendency expressed by the independence party and some of the leaders of the Society for the Preservation of Monuments suffered defeat. They then chose a new tactic. Like a child, they have many names, but the whole list amounts to essentially a couple of hundred people. At present we have started work on the rayon level, explaining the anticonstitutional nature of these actions. We also have a positive program. It consists in establishing soviets in villages, uyezds and cities. In the fall, during the elections, they will get new people, who will be able to act on the people's behalf as the representatives of the Soviet regime. These people will be our support. I believe this is a constructive move against the movement for citizen committees. And no extreme measures need to be taken; the movement will die out anyway.

[Correspondent] What is your attitude toward the idea of a referendum, which the People's Front talks about. We have in mind Maryu Lauristin's "Open Reply to an Open Letter."

[Titma] The problem for the People's Front is to have authority among the Estonian population. At present the process of acquiring sovereignty and restoring the Estonian nation's rights is taking place within the framework of the Constitution. Through the party we are taking actions where, in our opinion, the rights of the nation are being infringed upon. And if all that can be done within the framework of the USSR, no other alternative will win out. The Estonians are sober enough people not to resort to adventures. And to reply with an outright denial or to act as M. Lauristin did in his reply is a question of the tactics of the People's Front, its question.

[Correspondent] I would like to hear your view on military questions.

[Titma] I myself did not serve in the army, and for that reason I will speak only from the viewpoint of common sense. Our boys could serve in the Baltic republics. I foresee that in the future we will encounter a tougher situation in the army. I am basing that on figures for the country, on a knowledge of the composition of draftees, on information concerning construction units, etc. I have no illusions. And therefore, I believe that a mother's pain for her son is perfectly natural. But to resort to the use of lofty subjects and slogans is simply unethical. It is another matter that it makes no sense to whip up emotions over the army. One must seek a constructive approach. For example, the question of students' service in the army has been decided. Relations between army and naval units and the local soviet authorities also await solution. Today they resemble a one-sided game: the military units do as they wish. With the environment, let's say. It is necessary to break up this harmful stereotype and place questions of the units' civilian life under the jurisdiction of the local authorities. As for emotional excesses in newspaper articles and television and radio broadcasts, they do exist. And, most likely, there is no getting around them; after all, the subject of the army used to be prohibited. And when people suddenly started talking about it, an outburst of emotions followed. Now this discussion needs to be shifted to a specific, sober footing.

[Correspondent] In your view, what is the concept of a Russian-language newspaper in a national republic?

[Titma] A complicated question. I will give you my opinion, but do not consider it the Central Committee's position. First, I think, is to realize that Estonia is a national republic where the Estonians have their only home. As a nation, the Russians have such a home in Russia, the Ukrainians—in the Ukraine, etc. It follows from this that the newspaper represents the republic and should help all people who have come here to acclimate themselves and feel at home. And hence the need to raise the problems that concern this community of people. I believe that the view that the newspaper should express the interests of the Russian-speaking population, first and foremost, is extremely mistaken. Those interests must be expressed, but the interests of people who live in

Estonia should come first. On the basis of the experience of the recent elections, one can assert that the nonindigenous inhabitants who came here in the 1950s and 1960s and their descendants are reacting calmly and realistically to the phrase-mongering that sometimes assaults us. They realize that the level of overall culture and the general situation in the republic will make it impossible for the extreme forces to gain the upper hand. These people conducted themselves very calmly in the elections and did not succumb to the extremists' provocations. I believe that stressing the interests of that part of the population and taking into account the real interests of all the non-Estonians living in the republic, regardless of region, are SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA's chief concern.

I would like to introduce both of these propositions into the channel of party-mindedness. What are the prospects of the Estonian Communist Party? Among Estonians—distressing. Because many Estonians, frankly speaking, associate only negative results with the Soviet regime and the party. And in this connection they do not just have in mind the notorious deportation of 1941-1949. They have before them a simple, humanly understandable example—in 1939 the Estonians lived better than the Finns. And for us Communists to say that the party has led Estonia to any sort of achievements is frivolous. Only one thing can attract Estonians—real actions for the sake of the future. That alone. The prospect is clear—we must work to accomplish real results. If we do accomplish them, the Communist Party will have both prestige and a future. But if we do not—it will suffer political failure. And in that sense the support of the IME [Self-Managing Estonia] and a significant change in the economic situation are absolutely essential to the party.

[Correspondent] The IME is already a reality, and an effort must be made to carry out that idea. But we know that among the Russian-speaking population the attitude toward the IME is not without ambivalence. The opinion exists that regional cost accounting undermines the foundations of socialism. Is the Central Committee taking that variant view into account?

[Titma] Unquestionably. And we are hoping that you will now write intensively about the IME. That there will be articles by economists who have dealt with these problems, and articles by practitioners. That is, that the reader will receive a detailed analysis of the idea. And the fact that a flood of accusations and disagreements has come down on us again, well—I previously spoke out in favor of farmsteads and individual farming in the belief that it was the only way to conduct an efficient agriculture. At least that is what world experience indicates. The leaders of the Internationalist Movement accused me of supporting private ownership, but that is nothing but a political label, nothing more. Everything extraneous associated with the IME must be cleared away. It is necessary to show the economic essence, to show what the IME actually will do for every person, the republic and, finally, the country.

[Correspondent] Scholars believe that membership in the IME would help free us of arbitrary actions by union departments. But won't it give rise to arbitrary local actions?

[Titma] I have no fears in that respect. Here is an example. In Lithuania the bureaucratic apparatus constitutes a critical mass; it can simply ignore all public opinion there. There are so many bureaucrats there that they themselves will live comfortable lives. But in Estonia that mass is fragile enough that the bureaucrats themselves are not able to call all the shots.

[Correspondent] The ukase of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet on changes and additions to the USSR's criminal legislation speaks of the discrediting of an official. Won't that lead to the abridgement of glasnost? Can't we, through our 16 November amendment to the Constitution, avoid its application within the republic?

[Titma] The amendment that we adopted at the 16 November 1988 session of the ESSR Supreme Soviet is a political act. And of course, we must not wave it like a flag. It must be resorted to only in exceptional cases. Because that means to enter again into a constitutional conflict. Yet some people want to apply this amendment to the Constitution on any and all occasions.

It is another matter that every state is obliged to protect itself against arbitrary actions. In a democratic state legislative punishments are minimal. But we are just in the process of democratization. As for my attitude toward the 8 April ukase, I believe that its drafting was hasty. The very concept of discrediting is so vague that, figuratively speaking, if you have a foreign pen you will get a 10-year sentence, while if you use a Soviet pen you'll get five years. Of course, that is wrong. Understandably, this haste was connected with events in Georgia.

[Correspondent] How do you view the language gradation from A to E that was recently made public? Doesn't it recall the notorious West German occupation ban?

[Titma] In many respects the Law on Language is also a political act. It is clear to everyone that in four years society cannot change fundamentally. And I personally take a calm view of this and foresee that not all provisions of the law can be implemented. But the law is changing the climate, and movement is beginning. In many respects for Estonians adoption of the Law on Language was an act of self-respect. On the other hand, for the nonindigenous population such a step represented a real change in the situation, because until that the general position was purely assimilationist, with no alternatives. Today in a legislative sense there has been a turn in the actual direction. One may argue about the

gradation in the requirements with respect to the mastery of Estonian for various positions. But one must welcome this act of making requirements explicit, for they remove the vagueness, which is worst of all.

[Correspondent] Thank you for the interview.

Debate on Brazauskas Plenum Report Published
18000672 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
23 Feb 89 pp 2, 4

[Speeches at the 17th Plenum of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee: "Debate on the Report by the First Secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee A. Brazauskas 'On the Work of Party Organizations To Unite the Republic's Community To Perform the Tasks of Perestroyka'"]

[Text] Speech by K. Zaletskas (first secretary of the Vilnius Party Gorkom)

The sociopolitical situation in Vilnius as throughout the republic is distinguished at the present time by a special dynamism and the activism of all social groups of the population, which has grown extraordinarily.

Today there is no one who is indifferent to performing the tasks of political and economic perestroyka. They have touched directly every resident of the city—regardless of social position, nationality, or age. Most Vilnius residents approve of the changes and support them, others are still doubtful, and yet others would like everything to stay as it was in the recent past. But the fact that some people are coming from clearly unrealistic maximalist positions and are even resorting to provocative measures is most alarming. Such is the political reality today.

This, no doubt, is also a result of the activity of some of the primary party organizations of Vilnius. Comrade Brazauskas's report correctly said that even some of the primary party organizations of our city have strayed from the daily and very important matters of their labor collectives and gone in great detail into a discussion of global problems and lengthy debates in which logical generalizations and conclusions are frequently lacking. It has become too fashionable to disapprove and to express lack of trust in the Lithuanian CP Central Committee and the practical actions of the government by evaluating them in a one-sided and categorical manner.

In our opinion this happened because at the start of perestroyka the leadership of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee had no clear position on fundamentally important questions of political life in the republic. The leadership was slow and sometimes clearly too late in reacting to the important events in the republic which followed one after another. And even when new decrees were adopted they did not explain them to the people.

And we lower-level party workers and the aktiv lagged more and more behind the development of events. Undoubtedly insufficient independence was and is an obstacle.

Today the situation has changed markedly. Quite a lot has been done in a short time. The position of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee in the area of improving interethnic relations has been announced, the election platform of the republic's party organization has been formulated, and other important political decisions have been made.

But today we are obliged to once again tell the republic's communists and all of Lithuania's people most clearly and unambiguously that the Lithuanian Communist Party and its Central Committee support the economic and political sovereignty of the republic only as part of the USSR and that further work by our party is possible only within the ranks of the CPSU. That is also the opinion of the absolute majority of the communists of Vilnius.

From earliest times Vilnius has been a multiethnic city. Therefore questions of interethnic relations, which have recently gotten much worse, are very urgent to us. And here, undoubtedly, the publication of the Ukase of the Presidium of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet "On the Use of the State Language of the Lithuanian SSR" has had an effect. In practice the Ukase regulates only the use of the Lithuanian language in the republic's state life and in no way affects the interests of other peoples living in Lithuania. Nonetheless, it aroused unnecessary passions in some labor collectives in Vilnius, which have not abated even now. That could have been avoided if the decree of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers which regulates the procedure for the introduction of the Ukase had been published promptly.

We did quite a lot of explanatory work in the city regarding the application of the Ukase in a relatively short time, but passions heated up and finally spilled out in a protest rally organized by "Yedinstvo". We are certain that if the Ukase on the use of the state language had been prepared more consistently and if more well thought-out explanatory work had been done before its adoption, unnecessary passions could have been avoided.

Of course, the rally's organizers cannot be excused for allowing those present to hear ill-considered accusations against the leadership of the CP Central Committee and the government of the republic and appeals to resolve the urgent problems of interethnic relations through economic sanctions. The fact that on 15 February rallies were held in a number of the city's organizations during work time does no honor to their organizers. The meeting of the bureau of the party gorkom evaluated these actions sternly. There is only one way out—emergency measures to resolve the problems of interethnic relations, which have gotten worse in the republic and the

city recently, must be taken. These problems are to be discussed at a forum of the peoples of the Lithuanian SSR. We approve of the idea of holding such a forum, and it should not be put off.

In the party gorkom we meet with representatives of the Sajudis and "Yedinstvo" city soviets, but these forces must be consolidated and united and their activity must be focused on resolving the ideas proclaimed by perestroika.

Ever-increasing and even, I would say, systematic pressure by the radical forces of various informal movements on party and Soviet organs where they make extreme demands on various issues is being especially felt in Vilnius. This destabilizes the situation both in the city and in the republic and prevents the community's efforts from being united and focused on perestroika and prevents economic and social challenges from being met. The report altogether accurately emphasized that we must decisively rebuff such phenomena and abandon connivance. At the same time, however, we cannot deny that quite a large number of the problems raised by certain informal movements are well-founded and must be resolved. There are quite a few urgent questions; time and possibly debates are needed to resolve them, and not just among the creative intelligentsia. In discussing many important questions we have neglected the main stratum of society—the workers. And the fact that in recent days the voice of the capital's production collectives has resounded so powerfully certainly confirms that we have not been able to properly shape workers' opinions on certain new phenomena of our life. I am not even speaking of the fact that it is altogether unclear to many communists and non-party people why we do not reject all the exaggerations and violations of objectivity which are now particularly characteristic of our mass information media. The report talked of this correctly and critically. We must stop the slander campaign against the Lithuanian Communist Party and its leaders and stop the dissemination of lies and one-sided fabrications about the past and the idealization of the bourgeois order.

It appears that some of our hurried decisions and our occasional unwillingness to evaluate the many-sided interests of various strata of society and the specifics of certain regions are causing a sharp reaction in many of the city's production collectives. Of course this is not an easy matter, but we must strive to resolve it.

In examining the thoughts expressed in the report, we must explain to the city's residents the adventurist, extremist nature of the 16 February declaration of Lithuanian independence made by the Sejm [parliament] of the Lithuanian Sajudis Movement for Perestroika; the realization of this declaration would have a painful effect on the Lithuanian people and cause additional difficulties in the political and economic fields.

In my opinion, there was absolutely no reason to demand that an extraordinary congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party be convened. I think that very soon we should continue work on improving the draft of the new Constitution of the Lithuanian SSR and discuss this draft with the public.

There is no doubt that the current Plenum of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee is a significant stage in the life of the republic's Communist Party. After objectively evaluating the situation which has taken shape in the republic, we must focus the efforts of all party organizations directed at consolidating society to meeting the complex challenges of perestroika.

Speech by A. Stankavichyus (personal pensioner)

Life now is so complicated that a person cannot fail to be alarmed. I think that the report quite fully reflected the time in which we now live. It is true that perestroika, democracy, glasnost, and pluralism fall upon us like a powerful flood current. We are swimming in this current and we are repenting—no one knows for what and to whom we are confessing; and more and more clearly we feel what they like to call the spirit that is moving among the people—the desire to separate from the Soviet Union. And that, of course, would certainly destroy us. I was a young soldier and I remember how at the end of the war the officers of our Lithuanian Division debated about the fate of Lithuania and about its future. And I know how these debates ended then.

And yet, no matter how bitter our past and no matter how bleak our history, I am today most disturbed by the question of to what extent we can be called communists.

The speaker was saying how we are afraid to say the words "comrades," "socialism," "Soviet Lithuania," and, heaven help us, "communism," but I would like to say to the esteemed secretary and the other members of the bureau that even in "Government Studio" programs we also rarely hear even this party form of address—"comrades," or the terms "Soviet Lithuania" and "socialist Lithuania." Rank and file communists ask how we should address people who are communists if our leaders avoid these words in their statements. Therefore the rigidity of our position and of the position of communists disturbs me. We did not join the party for the sake of a bigger piece of the pie, as some people now assert, but precisely because we were drawn to the ideas of socialism and communism, of which our poet Eduardas Mezhelaitis once spoke so well.

When the question is posed so rhetorically, people recall very simple and vital things. The Sajudis Movement has the newspapers ATGIMIMAS and KAUNO AIDAI and many other newspapers. So it has its own press. Our writers also have a press—LITERATURA IR MENAS and PERGALE. The trade unions now have two publications, the Tevishke Society has GIMTASIS KRAS-TAS, and the Komsomol has KOMSOMOLSKAYA

PRAVDA. They say that even the Lithuanian Communist Party has its own press. Namely the Central Committee organs and the organs of the city and rayon party committees.

The speaker here talked of the troubles of this press. I would like to cite several examples. Take, for example, the Varena publication MYARKIO KRASHTAS. Some scout called Tuntininkas writes that not everyone will be able to become scouts. Above all Komsomol members and Pioneers cannot. But if they really want to join, they must leave the Komsomol or Pioneer organizations. You understand, the party newspaper is agitating for Pioneers and Komsomol members to leave their organizations. I will simply cite the Yurbarkas newspaper SVIESA: "During the dinner break we went with the philosopher Arvidas Yuozaitis to visit the editorial office of SVIESA. There we looked through the SVIESA publications of recent months. Arvidas Yuozaitis praised the newspaper's cooperation with Sajudis." But if he had criticized it? Or here—the editor of the Armenian newspaper VIENYBE responds to one reader whose reproach was that the newspaper writes too little about the terror of the bourgeois nationalists in the postwar period. The editor tries to persuade him saying that he can sense the pain in his letter, but that he does not understand the situation—today we must talk only of the victims of Stalinism.

I think, how did it happen that the editors of the party organs and the collectives of the party organs rose above their committees, whose organs they are? TIESA, and CHERVONY SHTANDAR, and other newspapers offer an "example." Therefore I do not at all understand the head of the ideological department of the Central Committee when he explains to the first secretaries of the party committees that they have to work with the editors. I think that we must work with the editors of such newspapers as ATGIMIMAS, GIMTASIS KRASHTAS, and KOMJAUNIMO TIESA. But it is my opinion there should be party discipline in a party organ. I do not understand why we fear straightforward talk. In America the communist party newspaper is published in much more difficult conditions than in our country and still the U. S. communists do not renounce their principles and their views of socialism, communism, and our country. I visited the editorial office of the French communist newspaper L'HUMANITE. There the situation is much more complex than in our country. But people do not renounce party principles and the foundation on which that newspaper was built. Therefore allow me to ask what the press section is doing, how is its work going? This is not the first time that we have talked about this.

We are not seeing polemics with the Sajudis press. When have we read in TIESA, SOVETSKAYA LITVA, or CHERVONY SHTANDAR an article polemicizing with the philosophical opinions of ATGIMIMAS or with other positions propagandized in this newspaper? Are we afraid to tread on someone's toes? But certainly they are treading on ours!

If we have a party press, it must follow our Central Committee's line.

The activity of our Institute of Party History also disturbs me a great deal. The statement by Comrade V. Kashauskene at that time did not satisfy me. All we hear now is national history, national history. It is necessary, of course. But certainly the history of the struggle of the Lithuanian proletariat also exists! The uprisings of the serfs, the strikes in the 19th century, the first of May insurrection. And what about 1905-1907, which Vayzhgantas called the troubled years? What kind of years were those? The years of the struggle of the proletariat? Why do we not analyze the history of those days?

Finally, there is the history of the Lithuanian Communist Party. I think we must seriously ask what the Institute of Party History is working on. After all, it is called the Institute of Party History.

The following also disturbs me as a communist. If communists sign anti-Soviet declarations, then we must seriously consider how to behave toward these communists. And in respect to and regarding the press, the science of party history, and other ideological affairs, as a communist and nonvoting member of the Central Committee, I am today, in the manner accepted these days, expressing distrust in the leadership of the ideological department of the Central Committee.

And here are several specific suggestions. We do not have just Sajudis; we have "Yedinstvo" and other informal movements. The activities of all these movements should be covered in general sociopolitical broadcasts rather than in the special broadcasts of each organization.

Speech by Yu. Kuolelis (Lithuanian CP Central Committee member)

For obvious reasons it would not be fitting for me to talk about how to follow the path of perestroika outlined by the 17th Party Congress and 19th Party Conference, much less to teach about it. I just want to briefly inform the participants in the plenum and, moreover, apologize to the republic's party organization for several mistakes on television where I, alas, happened to work for a short time. In your presence, esteemed comrades, I would like to bow low and apologize above all to Antanas Sniechkus and his memory and express profound regret that it was precisely on television, though it was on the program "Wave of Revival" which we do not control, that his name was defamed. At the same time I would also like to apologize to the comrades-in-arms of Antanas Sniechkus, living and dead, and apologize to the veterans of the party and the people's protectors who fought for socialism in Lithuania, and I would like to apologize also to my own personal friend Yanush Fedorovich and other party workers who were insulted on television. However, I should tell you that it was not the Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting that offered the air to

the party opposition—it is offered here in this building, and by small meetings in our absence, as Comrade L. Shepetis likes to say, "in our circles." You and I are not members of this circle as far as I know and many members of the Central Committee Buro are also not members. They make a decision, they call, they say do it, obey, and if you do not and something happens, you are responsible. I remember one conversation after the unpleasant events of last year on Gediminas Square, Comrade General S. Lisauskas said begrudgingly and correctly: "From now on I will not send out a single soldier from the barracks without a written decree of the party organs or the government."

It is difficult to say whether the content of television programs is discussed beforehand at conferences in the "narrow circles." Most likely not, if last Wednesday 15 February on the "Wave of Revival," everyone probably heard it, there was an unequivocal threat that if the republic's authorities did not listen and begin to retreat and succumb to pressure from the Center or to any other force on language or other issues they would simply be left hanging in the air. It appears that dictating to the authorities in their offices and at small meetings and expanded ones is even stronger and is backed up by blackmail and threats, and the authorities obey. Possibly even I should not have heard the verbal instructions of the Central Committee leadership on introducing certain programs and direct broadcasts from congresses, rallies, conferences, and Polish Catholic churches; and on television and radio we should possibly not have allowed people from Sajudis, among whom are truly prominent, able, and talented persons without whom, frankly speaking, it would be impossible to prepare serious scientific, economic, artistic, musical, or literary broadcasts, just as it would obviously be impossible for the Lithuanian leadership to prepare the conception of the republic's economic independence, the draft of the Constitution, and many other documents without them. The lack of a fixed position and the maneuvering, especially of the ideological leaders, have done a great deal of harm to the republic's party organization, the mass information media, our ideological cadres, and perestroika as a whole. At the last plenum of the Central Committee in this hall Comrade E. Mezheleytis correctly proposed the following to Comrade L. Shepetis: "If you're going to limp along, do it by yourself. What does the party have to do with it? You are even forcing others to do the same thing."

I was very surprised by the proposal that he submit his resignation, although there are shortcomings in his work—big ones and many of them. Especially since Comrade A. Brazauskas in my opinion understands the complexity of our life better than anyone. He understands what working with the mass information media means today when what is happening in real life is one thing, and what one would like to see on television and in the press is something else. For you remember that the party conference demanded that we show real life and provide full glasnost and the real truth, all the truth.

Thus, the election campaign is taking place in an environment which is not very favorable for the bloc of communists. How should we show people's support for this bloc, and how should we present the communists who are candidates for deputies? We tried to show more of them and to show them more often. But more certainly does not mean better. Comrade S. Gedraytis, the Central Committee secretary, has appeared on television more than once. But he has hardly won more sympathy from the voters as a result. Television seems to shine through a person and show what he is worth, his competency and his intellect. Therefore many people are simply afraid of television. It is difficult to persuade people, especially our party and soviet aktiv.

When Comrade L. Shepetis accompanied by his faithful fellow-traveler and pupil Comrade Yu. Paletskis presented the new chairman in our collective, he lied again, started "limping," and said that I supposedly had put in my resignation and that the buro had expressed its gratitude to me. But none of that happened. There was no resignation, no gratitude, no pension, and no work. Obviously, it was decided, once again at a "small meeting" and with the opposition or without it, to throw the next bone on the eve of 16 February. The bone was to offer a stack of sacrifices to the press on a crash basis: the minister of culture, of whom there was already talk, and suddenly the chairman of the Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting was added on. There, they seemed to say, now things will be a little easier for you, only don't touch us. It appears that Comrade Ye. Trofimov, who is today here with us, was also informed at the same time that supposedly "measures have been taken to eliminate shortcomings and to lessen the tension in the republic."

How familiar these methods are to us from a long time ago and not so long ago. Perhaps they would have been of use even now, if they had been compatible with the spirit of the decisions of the 27th Party Congress. The congress which devoted special attention to such a moral quality of communists as decency. This very important word is even recorded in the Party Charter. But after all the charter is to be followed, people are to be guided by it. And the second thing—is it really true that these and similar measures unite communists and mobilize their militance and principledness, and do they really not encourage hypocrisy and opportunism, which Lenin was especially intolerant of? It particularly cripples young party workers and creates uncertainty and a feeling of fear for the future, for the work, and for our livelihood.

As practice shows, anything can happen with people in our rule-of-law independent state of Lithuania. For it is well known, and others know too, how I was blackmailed and the local Sajudis extremists forced me to act with certain members of the committee's collegium, even using the party committee as a cover, but my conscience and the refined Party Charter did not allow me to obey them and give short shrift to the people. But does this Charter perhaps not apply in Lithuania's Communist

Party? For the appeal of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee to the voters speaks in favor of federalism in the party. And it even alludes to Lenin, although, as everyone knows, Lenin was always against any federalism in the communist party. If I had sacrificed these people, I could possibly have managed to work for just another 2 years—to pension age. Is it possible that a conscience is not necessary in our age of perestroika? There are quite a few people who believe that a conscience is an obstacle in political struggle.

Excuse me for speaking so much about myself, or rather through the prism of my own experiences. But what can you do?

In conclusion I would like to recall the Czech publicist Julius Fucik, who was in a fascist prison when he wrote the well-known book "Report with a Noose Around my Neck". In this book he called upon people to in no case lose vigilance but to fight for socialism. His appeal is also essential to us. It is infinitely important right now.

Speech by Y. Guretskas (secretary of the Presidium of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet)

All last year the events of our life were changing as in a kaleidoscope. We rejoiced at the good changes which perestroika brought, the perestroika which awakened the consciousness and activism of people. We learned to speak openly and boldly and express our opinions. It began to be interesting to live and work.

But under close analysis of the life of our republic, the activities of its party organization and the Central Committee, especially recently, aroused more and more doubt about whether we are doing what a communist's consciousness and convictions require.

I will try to present these doubts and my own opinion at this plenum, where, I hope, like-minded people have gathered.

First of all I would like to talk about the so-called "real sovereignty". I, like many others, approve of the concept of economic independence, independence in politics and legislation, and more precise demarcation of the jurisdiction of the Union and the republics. I am against predominance of Union and republic departments in the activities of the collectives. I am also for national renewal. However, I have supported and will continue to support socialist, Soviet Lithuania living in the family of Soviet peoples.

Let us see how this desire of ours has been transformed in recent months. In the press, radio, and television broadcasts, the concept of sovereignty is being presented more and more often and more and more openly as the necessity of separating from the USSR and creating a separate independent state.

The leaders of Sajudis impose this idea particularly persistently and methodically in the press and in the television program "Wave of Revival," even at meetings with voters. Whether we like it or not, this idea is taking over the minds of an ever greater number of people, especially young people, who are impressed by imaginary independence from the USSR. Close ties are supposed to be established with Western states, to join the community of European peoples, so to speak. They say that only then can we be free, only when Lithuania begins to flourish and when it is neither Soviet nor socialist.

Thus, on 15 February the program "Wave of Revival" abounded with ideas of occupation and colonialism: "A colonial policy is being followed"—Vayshvila. "As usual the Center wants to keep us on a short leash"—Prunskene, "Lithuania has been occupied for decades," and "our freedom in the worst sense of the word." We have heard such pearls more than once. That is what ATGIMIMAS and dozens of little Sajudis newspapers which come out in almost every rayon write. LITERATURA IR MENAS and GIMTASIS KRASTAS are permeated with such thoughts and KOMJAUNIMO TIESA does the same thing.

The Sajudis Sejm seemed to summarize these opinions when at the extraordinary session of 16 February it adopted a declaration which talks unequivocally of Lithuania's independence.

Did we help in this transformation? Was it really with the connivance of the Secretariat and Central Committee Buro that the mass information media went so far as to propagandize independence? Why do we speak of our resolve to be part of the Soviet Union so cautiously, as if we anticipate trouble?

When our secretaries and members of the Central Committee Buro constantly remind us that we support Sajudis and approve of its causes, even communists begin to question whether we approve of the concept of independence worked out by Sajudis. The chairman of the Sejm Council V. Landsbergis used television to make the declaration public throughout Lithuania, but who among us evaluated it and who spoke out against it? No one. But, you know, silence is a sign of agreement.

So do we perhaps also support the speakers who from the tribunal of 16 February said that Lithuania was occupied and annexed and that we are in colonial slavery? The Sajudis leaders did not mince words. The following slogan was born: "Occupiers, get out of Lithuania!" What will we do in this case?

At a meeting of communists of the Production Association imeni 60-letiya Oktyabrya Comrade V. Berezov said that certain Sajudis representatives betrayed their positions and retreated from the program they themselves have adopted. I would say that it was not certain leaders of Sajudis that acted that way, but all of them.

On 16 February no one anywhere was talking about Lithuania after 1940. It appears that there was no Great Patriotic War and no fascism and no difficult postwar years. And they deliberately said nothing. Understand: there was no Lithuania after 1940. It was an occupied region, an enslaved people. And when the alarm is rung and people hold forth in the presence of Central Committee Buro members and when none of them even tries to object, it is no wonder that people, especially those who did not experience the horrors of war and of the postwar years, get the impression that this is true. That is how black at times becomes white.

It has reached the point that the press and television are openly used to explain the following: the leaders of the communist party such as Antanas Sneckus and others were enemies of their own people as were all those who created Soviet Lithuania, and we, the people's disgrace, the people's protectors, are thieves while the Soviet soldiers were murderers. And the real bandits who sadistically murdered men, women, children, and old people are now called partisans and champions against the occupation and for the independence of Lithuania. Now they are heroes. Landsbergis-Zhyamkalis, the father of Vitautas Landsbergis, the very person who on 23 June 1941 was a member of the government of the front of activists of Lithuania and a minister, became the greatest hero. He together with others signed the declaration in which he expressed his gratitude and I quote: "to the savior of European culture Adolf Hitler and his army... for liberation" and they promised "to help the German army in all possible ways in its historical campaign in the struggle against Bolshevism". That same Hitler who planned to destroy Lithuania! The Sajudis leaders and many of their helpers are persistently trying to compromise the revolutionaries, the members of the underground, the frontline soldiers, the partisans, and the activists of the postwar years. The means necessary are not reckoned with. Read the article "The Pain of the Sacred Land" in the recent issue of the newspaper LITERATURA IR MENAS. It slings mud at the Yurgaitis family, revolutionaries and underground members who are well known and respected in Lithuania. Even the parents who are dead are not left in peace. Just as on the day of his wife's death, they slung mud at Yustas Paletskis. So there are the sanctimonious Sajudis members and heralds of independence for you. But, they say, we are continuing the debate, learning democracy, in their own way justifying the insults by ignorance and freedom of the press and the journalist. So can we call the desperate bark of a dog instead of human speech broadcast on radio recently ignorance? Or is this perhaps the freedom of the journalist?

These ideas are not new, we have heard them repeatedly at Central Committee plenums and at conferences of secretaries; party and Soviet workers are seriously concerned about the situation. So what are we waiting for?

Talk about the status of communists of Lithuania began not so very long ago. The more people talk about it the further we go. And the more loudly they talk. Only no

one has yet precisely formulated what status we aspire to. The Central Committee appeal says "... we are going to achieve a fundamental change in the status of the Lithuanian Communist Party." Fundamental! What does that mean? When it is not clear what the Central Committee wants, statements ring out more and more loudly about the communists of Lithuania separating off from the CPSU. Talk is going around about an independent party with its own program and charter. The Sajudis leaders and their helpers support this idea; it plays into their hands since it will be possible to gradually weaken party forces and promote a split in the party. And a weak party no longer represents a threat, it can be deprived of authority at any time.

Even certain communists who are Sajudis members pursue such goals.

But once again we must clearly tell all Central Committee members and all communists what we want and we must speak openly, in plain terms. I, for example, am for great independence of the party, but together with the CPSU. Together!

I want to propose the following: let communists who do not support the party's goals and its program and practical actions, such communists as B. Genzylis, who slander and denigrate the party, who demagogically equate the criminal activities and mistakes of the former leaders of the party with the goals of the communist party and who call the party an enemy of the people and the nation leave its ranks as K. Moteka has done. We are not on the same path as such "party members". It will be easier for everyone to breathe after we have cleansed ourselves of accidental people who joined our ranks out of career considerations.

And there is one other thing. We have repeatedly been called upon to extend our hands to one another and walk together in the name of Lithuania. Allow me to ask, to whom am I supposed to extend my hand? To the person who welcomed Hitler or to the one who killed completely innocent people and shot at us postwar Komsomol members and communists, or to the person who hates me today? No. Perhaps it is better to build our Soviet socialist Lithuania without such figures. We have managed to save it, to protect it, to renew it, and I think we will manage to make it become economically strong and independent. I propose the following:

1. Once again take the party press into our own hands. Demand that communists working in other press organs work as befits communists. And managers of the press and the press section of the Central Committee should not be allowed to hide behind statements that supposedly every journalist is a free agent.

2. Close all Sajudis newspapers and so-called newspapers which are published in cities and rayons. Not one of them helps perestroika. One is enough—ATGIMIMAS, but even this newspaper should be monitored.

3. The television program "Wave of Revival" should not be broadcast live. Take away the free microphone from the Sajudis leaders. That is how they have been allowed to disinform the public and express antisocialist and antiparty opinions for so long. There is no diversity of opinion in this program and only one opinion is persistently imposed.

4. Ratify the Ukase of the Presidium of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet on accountability for violating the procedures for holding rallies and demonstrations. Order must be imposed. I know that the proposal will make the Sajudis members indignant, but I see no other path.

5. Do not allow enterprises and organizations to transfer capital earned by the collective to Sajudis. The managers of ministries and departments and bank employees can and must prohibit it. It is surprising that banks at times do not allow a few rubles to be freely used for the needs of enterprises, while thousands are transferred with their consent for who knows what purposes.

6. Organize discussion of the decree and materials of this plenum in party aktivs and at party meetings. We must all be present at them. Correctly and comprehensively evaluate the political situation and listen to the opinions of communists. Familiarize the entire population with the plenum's materials.

7. Demand personal responsibility for their actions from the members and nonvoting members of the Central Committee. Whoever does not agree with the Central Committee position must openly explain the motives for his behavior.

It is possible that my speech will be evaluated as the "resistance of the conservative forces... a yearning for a strong hand." These are the words from the Central Committee appeal. I am not for a "strong hand" which would oppress or pressure, but I am against a hand from which everything slips away and from which political adventurers and demagogues can seize power and use it for their egoistic purposes, using the interests of the people as a cover.

The decisive moment has come, as the Sajudis members say. And we should not forget that if we let this moment pass, in the fall at the congress of people's deputies of the Lithuanian SSR, we may hear about Lithuania's separation from the USSR.

Speech by V. Sakalauskas (Chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers)

The political situation in the republic is really complicated. I consider this an expression of intensifying democracy and glasnost. But the ill-considered and, I would say, tactless, provocative actions of the extremist elements and certain participants in the informal movements are alarming. We must stop trying so hard to

ingratiate ourselves with them and fear them less but speak with them realistically. By soberly evaluating the situation, we should see where people's actions are directed and why they are poisoned with various illusions.

But we must not delay any longer, for a great deal has been wasted already—the society is being destabilized and production rhythm is being violated. It is unbelievable but a fact that in certain ministries, departments, Soviet organs, and even in law-enforcement institutions it is not the leaders nor the party organizations who are setting the tone, but the representatives of informal movements or their leaders, who frequently are striving for cheap popularity and thirst for glory. It is absolutely unacceptable that informal groups exist in party gorkoms, gorispolkoms, the militia, the courts, and the procurator's office. The primary duty of both party and administrative organs is to fight for perestroyka, and there can be no question of any informal groups in these collectives.

It was only irresponsibility, vanity, and the lack of a firm position which led to the mass information media becoming propagandists for ideas which were frequently alien to us rather than tribunes of perestroyka. Why do the same people always appear on television? Why are the upstarts and rumor-mongers not brought to accountability?

Are we going to continue to tolerate the mass information media seeing only the mistakes, the evil, and the dark sides of what we do, and nothing good? Besides, by repudiating everything and scorning everything rather than consolidating forces and resources, we will not accelerate progress and we will not achieve the desired sovereignty more quickly. However, that does not mean that we should not reveal the shortcomings, two-facedness, and spiritual decay which has taken place and is taking place. We must do all of this, but without exaggeration and without harming the foundations of socialism. The position of the mass information media should be clear—it is a party, Soviet position. I am profoundly convinced that there should be no place here for various informal groups.

It is particularly important for the Council of Ministers to prepare as quickly as possible to implement the concept of economic independence which is the real path toward political, legal, and cultural sovereignty. Quite a lot has been achieved in this direction. This concept has been created by the efforts of scientists and specialists. It has been broadly discussed. The public has been familiarized with it. The leaders of the party Central Committee and the Council of Ministers and the managers and specialists of economic departments have put a great deal of work into convincing Union directive organs that our program is a good idea. A significant point was

reached at the meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo last Thursday—starting early next year the republic is to be allowed to work in the new conditions of economic activity.

As optimists but at the same time realists we understand that everything cannot be achieved immediately, in one sweep. It is a pity only that our persistent desires have recently been disparaged by certain economists who categorically favor complete economic sovereignty immediately and not as part of the USSR. Such statements incite bad, hostile sentiments among the population and cause distrust of the party's economic strategy. The fact that certain scientists often ramble on without documentation, play on people's feelings, do not recognize opponents' opinions, and even insult people who think differently is harmful to open debate and the common cause. I would say that scientists who devote too much time to talk, agitation, and carrying out all kinds of actions which have nothing in common with the further development of science and its practical application have moved away from their immediate job. But there are a multitude of urgent questions. The leaders of scientific institutions, above all the Academy of Scientists, should not forget about that.

Together with the State Committee for Statistics [Goskomstat] our scientists should carefully analyze the condition of interrepublic ties. As statistics show, imports of products into the republic today exceed exports by almost 1.1 billion rubles, and this difference increases every year. Of course, this situation will change (and not to our benefit) if the transition to new wholesale prices is carried out. If the difference between imports and exports of products (the balance) is calculated according to the prices of the world market, by USSR Goskomstat calculations, it would be approximately 3.5 billion currency rubles to our detriment. I do not doubt that these figures are debatable because of imperfect methodology, but neither Gosplan nor the scientists have yet managed to show and evaluate the real situation. How much longer must we be "dependents"? That demeans our honor and dignity. The republic's government intends to prove that we are not dependents, but to do so we need concrete, practical help from scientists—economists and planning specialists. Of course, that does not mean that we do not need to take advantage of the country's economic potential. Thus, if the entire balance of production and consumption of fuel oil resources was translated into world prices, in order to satisfy the republic's needs for oil and fuel alone an additional 1.6 billion dollars a year would be needed. However, at the present time the republic produces output worth approximately only 0.5 billion dollars a year.

Of course, in the future we may be richer because ties are expanding. But even these ties should be developed in an enterprising way on a mutually beneficial economic basis. Unfortunately, strange things are certainly taking place. Thus, in January of this year the Plinkshkes Agricultural Trade Sovkhoz in Mazheykskiy Rayon

decided to sell its partners from Poland scarce materials and output on the basis of direct ties. What did the farmers intend to sell? What else but bathtubs, sinks, and other construction materials, televisions, musical instruments, carpets, motorcycles, passenger cars and trucks, and even coffee and tea. And they intended to buy chewing gum, alcoholic drinks, fruit, vegetables, berries, chinaware, stationery, and the like. You have to agree these are objects which are not a primary necessity in the economy. But in that case where did such boldness, such impertinence come from? It is good that we noticed this in time and brought them to accountability. We certainly do not need such trade. I want to emphasize that any perestroika is altogether inconceivable without the proper discipline. But what a multitude of people are diverted from their direct work by all kinds of rallies and similar actions. If you look at those who attend rallies during work time you will see that they are workers of various institutions, organizations, and departments. You get the impression that these organizations can do quite well without them. Obviously, in places there are too many workers on staff. So perhaps their number should be decisively cut.

One other question is disturbing. In our opinion, in many respects there is a lack of discipline and responsibility when the collective's capital is used. A number of plants, organizations, and kolkhozes transfer enormous amounts of money to various movements. Thus, the Kaunas Banga Association transferred 100,000 rubles from the social-cultural fund for such purposes, the Paneris Sheep Sovkhoz transferred 20,000 rubles from the social development fund, the Litmeliovodstroy Association transferred 30,000 rubles, and the Lithuanian Production Association of Computer Technology and Informatics transferred 7,000 rubles from above-planned profits received. A great many more such examples can be named. More than 50 collectives transferred 5,000 rubles or more to the Sajudis account alone. But do their workers know about that? Do they agree to such a decision? Would it not be better to satisfy the needs of the collectives? Is the state really so rich? In our opinion, they must not behave that way. If a collective wants to give aid to a movement, personal money of its members should be collected. And then it would be at each person's discretion how much and to whom to give and donate. Despite the storms and winds of various orientations, our ship of perestroika should not deviate from the course of socialism. Therefore we are obliged not only to consolidate our forces but each person should do his share with a sense of great responsibility.

Speech by G. Zabulis (Lithuanian SSR Minister of Public Education)

This plenum reminds me of the "Over 30" club, since those who have been in the party for a long time are speaking here. Therefore I have dared to speak myself.

I want to begin with the ideal of socialism. Now every person who mentions the concepts socialism or communism is invariably accused of stagnation or retrogressiveness, but I want to remind you that the ideal of socialism

has existed for approximately two and one-half centuries and all the famous representatives of mankind—Yambul, Campanella, Thomas More, Marx, and Lenin strived toward this ideal. Even the major religious movements such as Christianity would not have become so widespread if they had not extolled this ideal. But now we are accused of this. It appears that this is our mistake and the party's mistake. The party at one time made many mistakes and clipped the wings of this great ideal and then made it altogether faceless and forcefully imposed it upon people and compromised the ideal in its own society and throughout the world. We must bring it back. Perhaps we should begin everything from the beginning. And it is above all we communists who should do this. Unfortunately, we frequently confine ourselves to talk about a particular defect but for the present we are saying nothing about the ideal, about the beauty, about the force of humanism included in this ideal.

A second factor. We committed one other large mistake. I support the working class, and the peasantry also, since I myself come from this class. But we have created a cult of the proletariat and we have forgotten that the intelligentsia exists—intellectuals, scientists, and writers. And what has that resulted in? We have pushed the intelligentsia away. And if Sajudis acts so vigorously today, that is because the intellectuals have started to talk, and they have begun to criticize us. And beyond any doubt revealed our mistakes and pointed out many shortcomings. We have learned a great deal from them. But by pushing the intelligentsia away, we have pushed the quality of educated intelligence out of society. So look at what is happening now—we are responding to polemics in the same way as they polemicize with us. For the point of rudeness has been reached and bad language resounds from high tribunes on television and in the press. We have crossed all boundaries in backbiting. I am ashamed. I can say the same thing about Sajudis, about "Unity," and about other informal associations. We have forgotten how to behave in a sophisticated manner and we lack the quality of educated intelligence. We must return to the norms of sophisticated behavior.

On the other hand I want to address both our party comrades and our opponents: we have become keen on duplicity. It was correctly noted that on the one hand we say one thing and on the other something altogether different. And that is no longer a principle but betrayal of principles.

There is one other factor—friendship of peoples. It is a most wonderful idea and a great many works have been written about it and many dissertations have been defended. But for a long time friendship of peoples existed in our country out of touch with national dignity. Certain formulas for defining a nation were developed, but there was little benefit from them. A nation exists for five millennia or more than 5,000 years and the representatives of the nation are able to understand to what nation they belong without any definitions. But we

asserted one thing and then another. And this is how it all ended. I cannot fail to also address the comrades from Moscow. Such a movement exists throughout the country—not only in the Union republics. It is taking place in the autonomous republics and in oblasts. For the principle of the nation was trampled upon. But there are two elements in a nation. The good one is its self-consciousness and self-respect and the bad one is its separatism and exclusiveness. Unfortunately, the positive side does not always win out at the crest of this movement. Even now we are seeing separatism, exclusiveness, and hatred of other peoples making themselves known. Some people are making a political career for themselves on this since they utilize the cheapest forces of the nation. As communists we cannot assent to this; we must respect our own nation and show it in all its glory. We can see it in what we have accomplished precisely in the period of socialism.

As for national education, I must criticize the Center and criticize myself. So-called interethnic or supernational education has been introduced in our country. This supernational education means the education of the Russian Federation. I have said over and over again and I assert today that supernational education cannot exist and should not exist. It cannot be pictured either theoretically or practically. Teaching in the school is carried on in the appropriate language and it relies on the culture of the people, and their traditions, otherwise it cannot be. But when I meet with people they put me on the spot: when will national education be set up, they say. I answer that national education is a process and we are just beginning it and will finish it when we have trained the first graduating class from our school, and perhaps not then either. But in response I hear that there should be such a school tomorrow. In lobbies there is gossip, a common thing, of abandoning the Russian language and the social sciences and sending people to study abroad—that is national education for you. I think that national education is education in national dignity by absorbing all good traditions of a people and the content of science, plus everything that is most valuable in world culture. It is the school of national self-respect. We should follow this path only.

I accept the criticism which the first secretary made regarding the shortcomings in the work of the Ministry of Public Education. I accept it because everything is not in order with youth organizations. We are taking and we will continue to take measures. But the antipedagogical trend is appearing to split the ranks of our youth and introduce confusion into their ideals, and imaginary pluralism is used as a cover. I have talked with Sajudis representatives and repeatedly explained that we would be acting against pedagogical science if we split the classes and set one-half of a class against another, despite what ideals we proclaim. Incidentally, in the old Lithuanian school the Scout movement was almost prohibited. Scouts were allowed certain activities only until the third

grade. The Ateytinin movement was prohibited altogether. And now we are trying to present these organizations as the ideal of national education. Some people approve of this, but it seems to me that we cannot take this path.

National education and economics. When we had no national education and work was done on the example of the RSFSR, everything was simple—the textbook was translated into Lithuanian and the syllabus or teaching manual was borrowed: the problem was solved. However national education requires more energy, more skill, more organization, and more capital. I dare to assert that Lithuanian education has not yet won such attention. Above all people are trying to take away from education; yet at a time when we must help education, we think about it for a very long time and mark time for a long time.

In conclusion I would like to talk about the Constitution. We should make the draft of the Constitution public and familiarize society with correct thinking. But at the same time we must prepare, and I am addressing Comrade Kuris, a law on education. The law on education is the law of the future for our people. We must work on it until national education is set up or at least its foundations are laid.

Speech by S. Gedraytis (secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee)

Along with other important tasks of political work in the new conditions, questions of activating primary party organizations in agriculture are becoming paramount. People who have not lost a sense of reality cannot fail to see that along with the positive elements party organizations in certain collectives have remained passive and therefore have begun to lose the role of political leader and have not managed to take firm positions when the question is the future of the republic's political life, the cohesion of society, and problems of economic independence. It is time for us to learn for all time that without the revival of the activities of party organizations in the rural areas and new impetus to their activities, even the most important documents of the Lithuanian Communist Party and the republic's government will not be realized.

We must try to make sure that the leaders of rural party organizations change their style of work, stop trying to solve economic questions, and not step in for managers and specialists but concentrate their attention on solving social, cultural, and spiritual questions in an accelerated way and actively support the aspiration of rural residents to master new forms of economic activity. Party raykoms should give all possible support and encouragement to this area of work by party organizations. In present conditions we must do everything to ensure that the status of secretaries of primary organizations as main organizers of political-ideological work in the rural areas

is raised to a new level in the eyes of the public. Above all they need practical help. But when necessary we should resort to organizational measures as well. Any delay is not to our benefit.

The second fundamental question is new economic relations in the countryside. There are those who think that what has already been created can, upon condition that it is refined, satisfy us fully. But the slowed-down rate of recent years attests to something else. We are definitely for a diversity of economically sound forms of economic activity, revival of the Leninist plan of cooperation, and recognition of the farmer as the true master of the land.

Agricultural firms and internal farm cooperatives are being created in the republic and their rayon link is being improved. Independent peasant farms are appearing. There are farms where the fixed capital created by the common labor of kolkhoz members is divided among the people on the principles of cooperation according to their labor participation. They have become stockholders and may leave their share of the property to their children. The draft of the Law on Peasant Farms has been published. It includes new elements in our agrarian policy.

Everything new that has arisen in the countryside was created at the initiative of the farmers themselves, which was actively supported by the party raykoms and their secretaries. In many cases they were the initiators. Farmers interpret the position sometimes taken by responsible officials of delay and stoppage as a vivid manifestation of the times of stagnation.

But at this decisive political moment it is important not to make a fuss and not to lose common sense and an enterprising attitude. Some people would even now like to eliminate the public economy and make their political careers in this way. Certain Sajudis figures should not be allowed to confuse people by portraying Lithuania's past only in bright colors. There were rich farms in Lithuania, but there were also those which were auctioned off by eliminating the peasant from the land and there was immigration and poverty. And not to recognize this means not to be objective.

The republic's farmers, who in many years of collective life and labor created modern farms and settlements, will decide how to run them without outside agitators.

Farmers have recently been greatly disturbed by the tendentious political statements of certain television and newspaper journalists against the former leaders of the Lithuanian Communist Party and the republic's government and the unobjective, one-sided depiction of the postwar period. They demand that we take decisive measures to cover these questions correctly.

In focusing our intellectual efforts on constructive labor within the USSR, the preparation of a new Constitution, and the concept of economic independence, we must not

lessen attention to perestroika of the internal farm system. If we cannot very soon manage to resolve the most urgent problem in the countryside—to provide the rural inhabitant with construction materials and give him the possibility of buying roofing shingle or cement and bricks, then we will not achieve high political goals either.

We are preparing intensively for our first truly democratic congress, which will take place on 11 March. The congress will consolidate both traditional and new trends of economic activity. A council which is widely representative of farmers will be elected and it will take up resolving the most important questions of the management of agriculture in the republic and protection of the farmers' interests. Such councils will also be elected in rayons and they will take the place of the councils of the agroindustrial associations.

Farmers want to act together. I think that the congress which will take place in March will serve that goal and unite all farmers in new causes and a new life.

ArSSR First Secretary 23 Feb Discussion with Republic's Intelligentsia

18300468 Yerevan *KOMMUNIST* in Russian
1 Mar 89 p 1-2

[Text of speech by S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian CP Central Committee, and following debate: "Uniting Behind a Platform of Constructive Work"]

[Text] As was already reported, on 23 February a meeting was held in the Armenian CP Central Committee with representatives of the republic's scientific and creative intelligentsia.

In opening the meeting, S. G. Arutyunyan, the first secretary of the Armenian CP Central Committee, said the following: We have gathered together with one purpose in mind—I would like to listen to you and exchange opinions in connection with the situation in the republic and in connection with the urgent problems which disturb the public and the republic's working people and naturally disturb our scientific and creative intelligentsia. We have a mass of problems, difficult and painful ones, which are now very acute and which demand that a correct line be worked out and that they be solved. We have experienced a very difficult year: what other year can 1988 be compared with? An extremely difficult year we have experienced! I am not going to speak in great detail about the past because we have talked about this repeatedly and evaluated it, although perhaps not always unequivocally and not always the same. A comprehensive, scrupulous analysis of everything that has happened in the republic is needed. When I speak of past times, it does not at all mean that everything is already behind us. Even now we are not experiencing an easy time and the situation in the republic remains tense. And we should approach it realistically.

Well then, if we are speaking of the intelligentsia, we have always consulted with it on fundamental questions, including during the events of the past year. We met with the representatives of the scientific and creative intelligentsia on the eve of the meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet which examined questions of Nagornyy Karabakh. At that time a very useful, interesting exchange of opinions took place and that in many respects helped us participants in the meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet to take a definite position in discussing this question and to express our point of view. I am referring to the meeting of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet on 18 July of last year. We met in September and October with representatives of the intelligentsia, consulted with them, and exchanged opinions. When members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo comrades N. I. Ryzhkov, N. N. Slyunkov, and D. T. Yazov were here, we had a meeting at the Academy of Sciences with scientists. A meeting was also held with the leaders of the creative unions.

Added to the difficult situation which we had in the republic was a terrible national disaster which of course aggravated the situation even further. Our people are in psychological shock and are still under stress. We bore enormous losses, comrades.

Despite the fact that all of us were not ready to work in such extreme conditions, and in fact world practice had not yet seen such experience, nonetheless an enormous amount of work has been carried on to mobilize the potential and reserves of the entire country to render aid to Armenia and, first of all, in the first stage to organize rescue work. I want to tell you in all certainty that the leadership of the CPSU Central Committee, the Central Committee Politburo, and the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee M. S. Gorbachev have given us and continue to give us enormous help (these are not simply words but fact). The CPSU Central Committee Politburo commission headed by N. I. Ryzhkov has done an enormous amount of work. One of the deputies of the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers is permanently in the republic to coordinate the activities of all the Union ministries and departments to eliminate the consequences of the earthquake. L. A. Voronin, the Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, who, I must say, is doing a great deal of effective work, is now here.

If we are speaking in the language of figures, I also would like to mention a few things. Immediately, from the very first, all aviation, both military and transport, and ground transport was mobilized. More than 1,500 cranes alone, about 900 bulldozers, and about 6,000 motor vehicles came to us. That is certainly an unprecedented scale for sending equipment and other aid for a republic. As for the amount of work in December, I will tell you plainly that we worked day and night and all efforts were focused on only one thing—to organize rescue work. Tens of thousands of people were under the ruins. About 40,000 were recovered, and of them we managed to save

15,000. And the work was carried out in a nervous fever; we were there in the disaster zone almost every day. People demanded that those who remained alive underneath the rubble be saved and we had to work in extreme and difficult conditions.

Now we face extremely complicated tasks involving renovation and construction work. The range of the work is enormous. Speaking of housing alone, we lost somewhere around 8 million square meters of housing space. According to the most conservative estimates we will have to build 4.2 million square meters of housing in the cities and rayon centers in the next 2 years and 1.6 million square meters in the countryside.

Of course, the situation remains extremely difficult even today. Now, when we must be in the disaster zone quite often, it is very difficult to talk with people; the demands which they make are fair. You can understand the position of our people. I will cite only a few figures, you are familiar with them: approximately 520,000 people were left without shelter and 170,000 people lost their work places. We mobilized all capabilities: railway cars, panelboard shacks, and tents. But that does not solve the problems, because it is difficult to live in tents, especially in winter conditions. But nonetheless, utilizing the resources of the entire country everything that could have been done in this situation was done.

The paramount task which we must perform is to provide people with housing and work. That is our most important task. Some comrades say—let's not hurry, let's think everything through again, and even if it takes 3-4 years more, then we will build in a thorough, modern, and right way. I do not think that such a formulation of the problem is quite right. We must build on the level of the contemporary achievements of urban construction, taking into account our national traditions. But we must build quickly. Only a person who has a well-appointed apartment or a person who has only seen the ruined cities on the television screen can talk like that. But when you meet with people and you see what condition they are in, you understand that we have no moral right to put off this task.

In this regard I think that the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, when they discussed these questions on 27 December, made the right decision by posing a very concrete task for 2 years—1989-1990. We have published all the documents of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers on the developing construction and renovation work so that the republic's population knows what the program is and how enormous in scope and grandiose the tasks which we face are.

A multitude of problems arises here. First, a seismicity rating of 9-10 points. Seismologists had to do a great deal of work. Incidentally, the country's best specialists came to us—scientists and designers. Microseismic zoning maps had to be compiled. Questions of hydrogeology

had to be worked up, and detailed designs and general plans for rebuilding cities and villages had to be prepared. This work is going on even now. Therefore, when today we justly criticize and very frankly pose questions of accelerating the entire volume of renovation work at the CPSU Central Committee Politburo commission and in the Central Committee and in the republic's government, we encounter a thousand and one problems which must be solved before we can build. Today we have no moral right to repeat the mistakes of the past.

Essentially we must reexamine our entire architectural construction strategy, taking into account national traditions and national architecture. Here our architects and our designers should have the last word. If something is done wrong, then there is no one else to blame but ourselves.

I should say that all the Union ministries are doing a great deal of work. You know that the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers charges the Union ministries with doing the entire volume of work involving the renovation of their enterprises. And we are posing the task in this way—to renovate on the basis of modern equipment and technology.

Not long ago a decision was made which is fundamentally important and of vital significance to our people. We know how sharply and painfully people reacted to the presence of an atomic power plant near Yerevan. There could be no two opinions on whether the atomic power plant had to be closed, and at the September 1988 Plenum of the Armenian CP Central Committee we considered this question quite plainly and said conclusively that the atomic power plant would be closed. Only the question of when remained. After the earthquake we came to the conclusion that the atomic power plant had to be closed immediately. Our positions found support and understanding in our party's Central Committee Politburo and then, as you know, the decision of the USSR Council Ministers on closing the Armenian atomic power plant was adopted. The first block will be closed on 25 February and on 18 March we will close the second block as well. This is a fundamentally important, correct, and necessary decision and our people very fairly received it with a sense of gratitude.

However, I should say that the closing of the atomic power plant also involves serious problems involving our energy resources. Here, of course, we will have to tighten our belts a little and realize, without fearing the word, the national program for conserving electricity.

The Armenian CP Central Committee and the republic's Council of Ministers have worked out a concrete plan of measures involving conserving the consumption of electricity. I must say plainly that there is more than enough inefficiency in the use of electricity in the republic. We must use electricity in a much more economical and

rational way in order to make ends meet. We must deal with a complex of questions in order to solve the problem of power engineering in the republic.

That above all means expanding the Razdan GRES by introducing four new blocks—the first block is envisioned for 1990 and thereafter one block will be put on line every year. This, of course, is a very intensive program, since we face a large amount of construction and installation work and an enormous intensification of forces is needed here in order to realize this program for the Razdan GRES.

At times one hears people saying: well, they closed the atomic power plant, but it looks like they want to set up simulators, that is, they want to keep the atomic reactor. That is absolutely groundless talk. The USSR Council of Ministers unambiguously recorded in its decree that the atomic power plant would be converted to a thermal power plant. Certain rumors are now being immorally spread concerning the atomic power plant. There is no basis for it. We will bring this program to its conclusion and on 18 March the atomic power plant will be completely closed.

The Ukase of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the Nagornyy-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast has been adopted. A Special Administrative Committee has been set up which will look to Union organs. The Special Administrative Committee works under the direct leadership of the CPSU Central Committee. Recently the USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Measures Involving the Introduction of a Special Form of Administration in the Nagornyy-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast in the Azerbaijan SSR" was also adopted. Among other things it says that USSR Gosplan and the USSR Ministry of Finances should use a separate line in the State Plan of Economic and Social Development and the State Budget of the USSR beginning in 1989 to envision the indicators for socioeconomic development of the Nagornyy-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast as well as measures to ensure the realization of assignments set by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree of 24 March 1988 "On Measures To Accelerate the Socioeconomic Development of the Nagornyy-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast in 1988-1995." The introduction in the NKAO [Nagornyy-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] of a special form of administration is a considered compromised. There are no winners here and no losers, but there is the common victory of sense and good will. It is a compromise dictated by the situation which creates the basis for normalizing relations between the two neighboring peoples.

I am not going to speak now about all the other problems and critical issues which the republic faces today. At the September Plenum of the Armenian CP Central Committee, we worked out a precise, scientifically sound

program which encompasses a broad circle of socioeconomic problems which greatly concern working people. We will unremittingly put this program into operation.

In speaking of the moral-psychological situation, I would like to emphasize that our people are really in a terrible psychological state. They have experienced stress and, moreover, even now they are in shock. I am not afraid to say that the people have been strained to the limit. Our fundamental task and our most important task is to bring them out of this condition and to inspire confidence in their own strengths and in the assertion that we will overcome these difficulties and resolve all the tasks which face us. And, of course, our intelligentsia has an enormous role in this work. Your word is authoritative, it carries weight, and I think that the successful realization of everything that has been outlined and of this entire constructive program will largely depend on the positions which the intelligentsia takes. Here I am referring both to economics and to social, and political, and ideological questions.

And there is one other thing that I wish to talk about. One must not excite the people and inflame passions through ill-considered words. Passions have already been inflamed to the limit. Our primary task is to consolidate the forces of the people in order to solve the problems facing us. Uniting behind the platform of constructive work is now our strategic line. If we are true patriots and we want to meet the challenges facing us, we must rise above personal ambitions and sometimes even narrowly egoistic interests which occasionally slip in. We are relying very heavily on our creative and scientific intelligentsia. We value and respect the intelligentsia and we cannot conceive of our work without it and without its active participation. Perhaps we are not always able to meet together so often these days and have concrete, meaningful talks because we are working in extreme conditions. But I think that is temporary, and we will meet more often in the future.

Today I would like to speak up on several questions which in our opinion are of fundamental significance, and I would also like to exchange opinions on the possibility of working out general approaches to problems together.

We have invited representatives of our scientific and artistic intelligentsia and the mass information media to this meeting for one purpose—together, openly, and without prejudice to discuss questions involving the role and place of the intelligentsia in resolving the problems facing the republic and the people.

I think that our talk should be frank, principled, and constructive. Let us together ponder the affairs of the republic and its problems and concerns. Let us ponder how to utilize the scientific-cultural and spiritual potential of the intelligentsia for the good of Armenia and the Armenian people and the good of perestroika.

Then the participants in the meeting spoke. **A. A. Grigoryan**, chairman of the governing board of the Armenian Architects' Union: First of all I would like to mention the enormous amount of work which the interdepartmental commission on urban construction is doing in the disaster zone. We could not have managed without the aid which is being given us, especially in the field of design. All the republics of the country, USSR Gosstroy [State Committee for Construction Affairs], and the State Committee for Architecture are helping us.

There is now a great deal of talk about seismic zoning—after all one-quarter of the republic's territory is in the active seismic zone.

In the 1970's we stunted on reducing the earthquake point-ratings of buildings and now we have lost thousands of buildings. We have no right to repeat these mistakes. I earnestly request that the earthquake ratings of structures be clearly specified. Today there is not one construction site where a building has been brought into line with the existing norms of urban construction.

I would like to say a few words about the program for helping the NKAO. I think that this program should be studied very carefully, since quite a few problems have accumulated in the area. Among other things, the question of organizing a design institute in Nagorny Karabakh should be sped up and the oblast should be provided with qualified architects.

G. G. Emin, poet: I wanted to address an open letter to Vladimir Surenovich Markaryants, but since the occasion is offered I will talk now. Ashtarak is the junction that links the northern part of the republic with Yerevan.

S. G. Arutyunyan: We are talking, as I understand it, about the new bridge? It is a fair question. Incidentally, at our instruction the Council of Ministers is actively working on this question. The first phase of the two-lane bridge is to be put into operation in the first 6 months of 1990 and the second—in the second 6 months.

S. A. Sarkisyan, people's artist of the USSR: No one is safe from another earthquake and no one can say what will happen tomorrow. We all know how our Yerevan was built and I am afraid that we built it worse than Leninakan and Spitak.

Even today it is impossible to breath freely in certain parts of the city and tomorrow the question of water supply will be a serious one.

S. G. Arutyunyan: The question of water is already acute now.

S. A. Sarkisyan: I believe that Yerevan must not be allowed to expand; pressure must be taken off the city. It would be very sensible to think about creating a new capital with a population of 100,000. Covering the entire

Ararat Valley with asphalt is ruinous for our republic. I think that a new capital would cost just the same as our Southwest development costs. So there is nothing frightening in this.

Z. G. Balayan, writer: We are getting the impression that the leaflets being distributed are reaching the minds and hearts of the population more quickly than the publications of the mass information media. Here we are not speaking of how well certain leaflets have been done but of how our mass information media are not in touch with the spirit of the times and sometimes lag behind or ignore public opinion.

I was in the NKAO for seven days. I talked with members of the Special Administrative Committee and was among the journalists of Karabakh. I should say that a great deal has already been done even now and it is simply a disgrace that people in Armenia do not know about all this. For example, the question of publishing a journal entitled ARTSAKH has been decided. The oblast journal organization has been made subordinate to the USSR Journalists' Union. But what are people saying in Yerevan? Igor Muradyan has become the talk of the town, and someone is making a special effort to spread rumors and lies.

S. G. Arutyunyan: I am especially interested in this question since I am in Moscow. The stories which are being spread about it are not in line with reality. At the present time Igor Muradyan is in Moscow. The investigation of his case continues.

Z. G. Balayan: The day before yesterday I spoke at the Polytechnical Institute and asked, "Who can say that he is more of a patriot than S. G. Arutyunyan and V. S. Markaryants?" Then where does the talk about the supposed rupture between the leadership and the people come from? Perhaps the intelligentsia and the mass information media are partly to blame for the perception of this split.

S. B. Kaputikyan, poetess: I want to express genuine gratitude to the Central Committee Politburo, the government of the country, and to our brothers from the Union republics who extended the hand of aid to Armenia.

What concerns us on the eve of 28 February? That there are no excesses on this day and that there is a well thought-out program. I have been informed, and I do not know to what degree this corresponds to reality, that no one who wishes to honor the memory of the fallen ones will be prevented from doing so.

When I talk about this, people rejoice. They are also no less concerned about the condition of the press, because we ourselves also encounter this every day. It has already been almost a month now that we have not heard a single word on the history of the Armenian people, on Nagorny Karabakh, and on our historical values on

television or in the press. In this anxious condition you yourselves can understand the consequences this silence may have. I know that all this is being done for a good purpose—not to arouse national dissension. But, unfortunately, it does the opposite.

Recently I spoke in Moscow at the plenum of the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union. My speech was well received. The most important excerpts about Karabakh and about Sumgait were printed in the Moscow press. I believe that the ice of mistrust between the Armenian and Azerbaijani peoples should melt away. And for that to happen both the Armenian and the Azerbaijani people must know the historical truth.

G. A. Galoyan: I want to say that neither the Central Committee department nor the Central Committee secretary are putting any bans on the press. When we have comments to make, we talk about this plainly.

From the audience: The level of the Moscow press must be supported. The way Moscow is evaluating today, writing about Trotsky and about Makhno...

Shch. B. Davtyan, editor of the newspaper SOVETAKAN AYASTAN: I should say that neither G. A. Galoyan nor G. Ye. Asatryan prohibited us from printing any article; there was no such ban. There were no bans from the first secretary of the Central Committee either.

S. G. Arutyunyan: Can any of the editors say that there was a ban on an article by the first secretary of the Central Committee?

From the audience: There was not.

Shch. B. Davtyan: Caution has reached the extreme recently. Now in every newspaper where the word "Karabakh" appears, the article is removed. For example, one of the authors wrote in an article: "When I hear about Sumgait, I am horrified." The author expressed his personal attitude toward the event. But even that appeared excessive to some people.

Our common goal is to follow the path of consideration and compromise. But to follow the path of truth.

I want to mention one other thing. It has become customary in the republic to ignore critical articles and comments. Criticism generally receives a hostile reception.

S. G. Arutyunyan: The Central Committee and its departments should carefully keep track of the critical statements of the press. The most important articles must be discussed at the bureau and in the secretariat of the Central Committee. This should raise the prestige of the press. Here in Armenia, I must say, an irresponsible attitude toward critical comments in the press has become established. An article is published, even one on

fundamental questions, but neither the Central Committee nor the appropriate ministries respond in any way nor do they take steps on the problems raised.

Shch. B. Davtyan: We are poorly informed. We want to cover the Central Committee and Council of Ministers decree on the NKAO in the press, but we have no source. How will the decisions adopted be fulfilled? We don't have such information. It is difficult to sit in Yerevan and write about the NKAO. But after all, we have 15,000 readers in Nagornyy Karabakh. And people in Armenia await our words. What should we inform them of?

It is obvious that interethnic questions must be covered more broadly when possible. But we must also be able to write about Karabakh too, for people are extremely sensitive to everything they hear. We must pit the truth against conjectures, provide explanations every day, and provide information. To do that we should have a regular correspondent in Stepanakert.

S. G. Arutyunyan: We agree that the newspapers SOVETAKAN AYASTAN and KOMMUNIST should have their own correspondents in Nagornyy Karabakh. And Armenpress as well.

G. Ye. Asatryan (from the audience): Armenpress has already sent a correspondent.

V. A. Petrosyan, writer and chairman of the governing board of the Armenian Culture Fund: I think that this is very important talk about the relations of party organs and the press. The position of the mass information media depends on the positions of the party committees. Now a course toward mutual restraint has been adopted. And that is right. We must not depart from historical reality. Our peoples lived next one another even before, and in the future they should work side by side. We must jointly and all together shape good-neighbor relations.

But just recently I happened to look at the 3 January issue of the high-circulation newspaper STROITEL of the Azerbaijani SSR Gosstroy. In it was published the article "There Is Only One Truth," in which flagrant attacks are made against the Armenian people and against historical truth. And all this was written not by a regular reader but by T. Aliyev, a docent, assistant dean of a construction engineering institute, and member of the republic's peace fund.

I am for restraint, but for mutual restraint. Who if not the intelligentsia should set the example here?

Now I would like to deal with the problem of refugees. Today it is a very acute one. As yet there is no complete clarity here, and that creates gossip and false rumors among the people.

From the audience: A precise position is needed.

S. G. Arutyunyan: The republic's leadership is not ignoring the concerns of the refugees. They are working in earnest on this problem. The complexities are extreme. We have half a million people without shelter in the earthquake zone. In Yerevan and other cities there are 94,000 people on the waiting list for housing. Plus more than 180,000 refugees. It is impossible to locate them in Yerevan and the Ararat Valley. It has been decided to use the mountainous regions and abandoned villages. The Armenian SSR Council of Ministers decree has been adopted which defines where and how to locate and find jobs for the refugees and also additional capital has been allocated to give material aid to those families who have not yet received it.

From the audience: The work is going on, but people have received very little information about it.

S. G. Arutyunyan: Now the members of the Central Committee buro are going out to the refugees and meeting with them and explaining to them in detail how the questions will be decided. I think that the intelligentsia should actively join in this important work. The question is a very difficult one. We are trying to convince people to go to the villages, there are houses there and work. But they are not going. Only a few families have gone.

From the audience: Perhaps they can be sent to Leninakan, Kirovakan, or Spitak, be given temporary housing, and let them live and work there?

S. G. Arutyunyan: Right now there are no possibilities at all in the earthquake zone—people are living in tents and garages and many have lost their work places and have no jobs.

V. A. Petrosyan: The search is on—that is important for everyone to know. When V. M. Movsisyan appeared on television with a commentary on the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers decree, the response was quite good. People clearly saw what was being done to alleviate the troubles of the refugees. Needless to say, at the same time work should continue to allow the refugees to return to their former dwelling places. But pressure would be unacceptable here.

S. G. Arutyunyan: It can be only on a voluntary basis. And that is what the decree says—on a voluntary basis.

V. A. Petrosyan: One last thing. In my opinion on 28 February people should not be prevented from bringing flowers to Tsitser-Nakaberd to honor the memory of those who fell during the Sumgait tragedy.

S. G. Arutyunyan: Such a decision has already been made. There will be a report by the ispolkom of the Yerevan City Soviet and the Military Commandant.

V. A. Petrosyan: This is the way I understand today's meeting—we have gathered to work out a program of joint work. People have experienced a psychological upheaval and right now they most of all need the kind word and good works of the intelligentsia. Our duty is to justify these hopes of the people.

R. K. Oganessian, chairman of the governing board of the Armenian Writers' Union: I should say that our general attitude toward the Central Committee leadership is a very good one. We evaluate its work positively and evaluate it with the understanding of what incredibly complex conditions it must resolve questions in today. The Central Committee must trust the intelligentsia more and rely more heavily upon it.

Now an enormous work front is developing in the cities and villages which suffer where the envoys of all the Union republics are laboring alongside our workers. News is coming from Nagornyy Karabakh—roads are being paved and regional cost-accounting is being introduced. But in the morning we open our newspapers and what do we see? Information about who was arrested for violating the curfew and who was drunk, where they live and their license plate number.

From the audience: Some police report...

R. K. Oganessian: We must show people's present labor and their heroic quest and inspire faith in tomorrow in the people who still have not come out of shock after the unprecedented catastrophe. To go on. Why not appear on television and in the press and expose the rumors and lies which excite public opinion? Truth is a good physician for the moral health of society.

Attempting to understand ourselves and the republic and the people—that is what is very important to us today. We also need to look again into our history. Recently in the newspaper PRAVDA Yuriy Nagibin dared to see the position of Rakhmaninov in a new way—it was not Russia that he did not want to return to, but Stalinist Russia. The well-known "Georgian incident" was covered in the central press without omissions and without concealment. I am certain that today we need well-grounded, truthful talk and a considered approach to certain historical personalities.

I agree that it is time for all of us together to think about reconstructing the capital. Those who designed it were overwhelmed by gigantomania. Take Sovetskiy Rayon. In terms of number of residents it is larger than Leninsk. But there is no children's hospital here and there are not enough cultural institutions and enterprises. So then why keep tacking development after development onto Yerevan?

G. G. Emin, poet: I am going to say what is bothering many people. When the problems of the socioeconomic development of Nagornyy Karabakh were raised, among the first was the impossibility of receiving television

programs from Armenia. A new transmitter has now been set up and the problem is solved. The next problem is that the highway from Goris to Stepanakert bypasses Lachin. It must be extended more quickly so that there is an uninterrupted link with Nagornyy Karabakh. Now that a special form of administration has been introduced in the NKAO, our contacts will grow. And the question of the road is becoming paramount.

B. M. Mkrtchyan, editor of the newspaper KOMMUNIST: I am not revealing a secret when I say that the tense situation will continue for a long time yet. I think we cannot get by without developing a flexible, comprehensive program of work for the press under the extreme conditions.

It has been rightly said here that television is being used poorly. I do not believe that all party workers should appear on the television screen. Those who have prestige and whom the people trust should be asked to speak. A dialog must be carried on from day to day and we must speak boldly and openly about shortcomings and problems. And then people will follow us.

The intelligentsia has a great deal of responsibility. Unfortunately, many of our scientists, pedagogues and artists are being indecisive. Some people do not want to take a firm stand and give a principled evaluation to events. They do not want to work creatively with editors. It is time for them to understand that editors are not opposed to bold, interesting conversation. Communication through the press requires special sophistication. Editors and authors must develop it together.

E. M. Mirzoyan, chairman of the governing board of the Armenian Composers' Union: As I understand, we are not having a conference today. We are having a trusting, open conversation. But why is it not going on the air? After all, this has already been done. The meetings of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo commission on eliminating the consequences of the earthquake are being shown regularly on television. People saw N. I. Ryzhkov sensitively and intelligently talk with the people who spoke and the frank and principled way in which he held people responsible for their omissions.

From the audience: Yu. P. Batalin and L. A. Voronin also conducted meetings.

E. M. Mirzoyan: Yes, they also conducted them, and the Armenian people could themselves evaluate each of them as a leader and organizer of the masses. Television gave them this opportunity. If meetings with the intelligentsia become regular, then they must certainly be shown on television. Our intelligentsia on the whole supports the course of the republic's new leadership. But opinions are different and at times even the exact opposite of one another. In order to bring them together, we must have a dialog—a direct and open one.

And there is something else. We do not forget that we are living under a curfew. It seems that we have already become accustomed to it. But we would rather not. Many things here depend on us, the intelligentsia. To make the tension diminish more rapidly, we must be more active in our vital work in the thick of the people.

D. M. Sedrakyan, academician and secretary of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences: Each of us is for glasnost, democracy, and renewal. But compare the programs of Central Television and Armenian Television, and you will see how far we lag behind present-day demands. Turn on Moscow and you will see how what has been done can be criticized and how it can be evaluated and how our plans for the future both on the level of M. S. Gorbachev and on the level of the worker can be built. But turn the dial to Yerevan and I, as a member of the intelligentsia, become ashamed: there is no controversy nor any serious talk.

It was very interesting to see how elections of candidates for people's deputies went in the country. We have not been shown anything of interest in the last three weeks. Even though there were things to show. Two candidates were nominated—Academician V. A. Ambartsumyan and the poet G. G. Emin. It is a pity that they had already become rivals in the preliminary stage, but a struggle is a struggle. It was an intense one. Viktor Amazaspovich won. Why didn't television tell about that?

Today we need more glasnost and more tolerance toward one another.

G. Kh. Sarkisyan, acting vice-president of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences: This is what I want to talk about. Ideological perestroika is going on in our country. It is going slowly in the republic as compared to what is being done in the country. We must step it up. We have been called upon to deal with the "blank spots" in our history. But why go so far back? Let us turn to last year. Let us examine objectively such a public phenomenon as the Karabakh movement. Quite a few ringing labels have already been slapped on it: "extremism," "nationalism," and the like. But it was glasnost and perestroika that gave birth to the Karabakh movement; it is their child. So let us thoughtfully and calmly look to see what in the Karabakh movement was true and in step with the times and what was not.

The natural disaster infused an absolutely new spirit in our history and in contemporary Armenia—unparalleled friendly aid and a flood of warmth and fraternity from all corners of the USSR and the globe. That warms our hearts. And we must make every effort to strengthen the faith of our people in the future and make them real and businesslike participants in the renewal which has begun in the republic.

V. A. Ambartsumyan, president of the Armenian SSR Academy of Sciences: Despite all the difficulties which we are encountering today, we must not ignore the main thing—the moral spirit and mind-set of the people. These things depend on the degree to which honesty and justice gain the upper hand everywhere. The republic's leadership is taking measures to normalize the ideological-moral atmosphere, and this line was approved by the September Plenum of the Central Committee.

S. G. Arutyunyan: Unfortunately, very little has been done as yet on a practical level.

V. A. Ambartsumyan: Of course, the strikes, the international tension, and the earthquake were hindrances here. But nonetheless I want to again emphasize that the moral spirit and spiritual health of the people is most important of all to us now. I often meet with people. And I will say frankly that such phenomena as dishonesty, speculation, corruption, and bribe-taking bother them most of all. People see them as the sources of society's moral decay. I have heard that bribes have even penetrated not only to admission to VUZes but also to the passing of exams.

S. G. Arutyunyan: Recently the law-enforcement organs arrested a teacher in an institute who had extorted bribes for an exam. The student offered 500 rubles but he demanded 800. That is what it has come to. We must deal with this disgraceful phenomenon together.

V. A. Ambartsumyan: We have lost one of the most important virtues of the Armenian people—its industriousness. I remember an exhibit in Kirovakan at the House of Quality. Fine items were displayed there. There was great detail about the technical characteristics and production technology. But not a word was said about the fact that these items were made by real craftsmen who are able to work conscientiously. It is not only at enterprises that conscientious labor is needed. It is also needed in our VUZes. If a lecturer encourages students who leave their studies to go on strike, he creates gaps not only in their knowledge but also in the conscience of the future specialists. They get used to the idea that they do not have to be demanding of themselves and they deal with their studies in a slipshod manner. Enormous effort is needed to change this psychology.

Look at the situation in our pure sciences. The lag here began in the 1960's. It got worse, but no one became upset. Why? We had forgotten how to make demands on ourselves and on one another. Today we have been forced to reap the bitter fruits of general irresponsibility. Innovative cadres are needed, modern scientific equipment is needed, and new organizational approaches to the creative pursuit are needed. There are a mass of most difficult questions. But we must deal with them if we want to raise our science and the science of Soviet Armenia to the contemporary level.

G. I. Matevosyan, writer: I would like to consider the question of the fate of those who were detained for violating public order. Among them are activists of the Karabakh Committee. What are they guilty of? If we cannot speak of this here, then where can we speak of it?

S. G. Arutyunyan: It seems to me that we should not equate the Karabakh movement with those people who are under investigation. The investigation is coming to an end and there will be an open trial. And then it will become obvious to everyone who is guilty and of what. If they are not guilty before the law, they will be released.

L. A. Voronin, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers: I think that everyone here today has one goal—to meet those complex challenges which face Armenia. The most important of them is to eliminate the consequences of the earthquake as quickly as possible. People need housing, work, and spiritual equilibrium. We have set a concrete goal: to meet next winter with no housing in tents and no schools or kindergartens housed in tents. This is an important political task. We are relying very heavily on the aid of the intelligentsia to resolve it.

Construction work is now getting underway in Leninakan, Kirovakan, Spitak, and in the rural populated points. Skilled workers are needed. Everyone knows that the Armenian people are born construction workers. Then why should we have organized recruitment of people from throughout the country. I think that together with the intelligentsia we could carry out the appropriate work and extensively recruit rural residents for construction work in the disaster zone.

Armenian science faces very serious problems and Academician V. A. Ambartsumyan did a good job of talking about them. We must begin to work together on them. Armenia has begun a great undertaking and it should actively serve the cause of perestroika and the cause of the republic's renewal.

I have made note of all the questions which were raised during today's meeting. They will be brought to the USSR Council of Ministers so that the necessary help can be given.

There has been much talk here about ways to normalize interethnic relations. That is natural. There is no alternative to good-neighbor relations between Armenia and Azerbaijan. All subsequent work must be carried on based on this idea. In this connection I would like to recall the words of M. S. Gorbachev: "We are all strong when we are together."

The Armenian people face a broad field of work. And it will be accomplished because Soviet Armenia along with our entire country is doing it.

S. G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian SP Central Committee, summarized the results of the meeting. Among other things, he said the following:

I think that we have had a detailed, honest, and principled discussion. I want to mention once again that we in the Central Committee regard our intelligentsia with a sense of deepest respect. The Armenian intelligentsia has never been complacent; they have always been distinguished by breadth of thought, true patriotism, love of freedom, and humanism. These constructive civic qualities formed throughout the entire course of our history have today been filled with new meaning and have acquired a new ring. Perestroika and the process of democratization have raised the social responsibility of the intelligentsia for the fate of their native people and for the renewal of the republic. Various approaches are encountered and pluralism of opinions is being confirmed in politics, art, and social life. I think that all these are natural processes in our crucial time.

We are glad that our intelligentsia is actively intervening in all spheres of life. In my opinion, it would be much worse if it were passive and did not intervene in anything but lived only for its own narrow interests. Its active, aggressive position is an effective factor in perestroika. We have a common task today—to consolidate the nation and unite our people behind a platform of constructive work. And here it is very important to more effectively and more boldly take advantage of the spiritual and cultural potential of the intelligentsia which appeals to the consciousness and memory of people and awakens their national, patriotic, and internationalist feelings and leads us toward common interests, common concerns, and a common constructive goal. Only by raising each worker, kolkhoz member, specialist, and manager as an individual will we be able to put him in the center of our transformation in the economy, public life, and the ideological-moral sphere and make him responsible for himself, for others, and for the renewal of his native region.

Our people are for perestroika and have accepted its revolutionary essence with their minds and hearts. Perestroika has given us the opportunity of openly talking about the deformations and serious mistakes which have taken place in various spheres of life. Perestroika has stimulated an upsurge of national self-consciousness and highlighted the problems of language, culture, and the historical past and present.

The crucial problem of Nagorny Karabakh, around which frequently dramatic and at times tragic upsurges of emotion have arisen during the year, has added to the general ideological-political situation in the republic. The republic was in a difficult situation long before February of last year. Serious mistakes were made for many years in the organizational and political work of party organizations. Their political influence on the masses has significantly lessened. People's social dissatisfaction has grown, violations of the principles of social

justice have become common, and corruption and bribetaking and distortions in cadre policy have flourished. The diminution of the authority of party and Soviet organs has resulted in obvious alienation of the working people from leadership cadres.

Our people wanted to see a positive, perestroyka-minded aspect in the newly-born Karabakh movement. However, forces managed to attach themselves to the movement which by speculating on objective difficulties tried to aggravate interethnic relations. The tragedy in Sumgait gave special drama to this process.

Taking advantage of the complicated problem of Nagorny Karabakh, certain activists of the Karabakh Committee inflamed passions, provoked illegal actions, and tried to bring the republic into chaos. All this resulted in an extremely dangerous spiral of tension in the situation.

I should frankly say that even among the representatives of the artistic and scientific intelligentsia, not everyone clearly saw the watershed between the Karabakh movement and the actions of self-styled leaders. If we speak on a larger scale, it was not they who were the founders of the movement. They only became the leaders and rode the wave of "rally democracy." And their ill-conceived and possibly deliberately calculated actions cast a shadow on the Karabakh movement. I would not begin to make great martyrs of an idea of them. They in fact prevented the problem from being solved by their irresponsible appeals and actions. Are ultimatums really a method of interrelationships in a civilized society? And what kind of a position did they put the republic's leadership in? For we were forced to work on solving the most difficult problems in conditions where the republic was being shaken by strikes, hunger, demonstrations, and ultimatums.

Life itself has shown that the complex problem of Nagorny Karabakh which came to us from the past can be solved not on paths of confrontation and interethnic hostility but on paths of sensible political compromises.

Perhaps we do not yet have the degree of consolidation which is necessary at the difficult, crucial stage of perestroyka in the republic. But the main thing, I am certain, we all understand—we need a sense of our common responsibility for the future of the republic and for peace and tranquillity in our common home.

For even now the republic is undergoing difficult times. For even now we need consolidation and unity as much as bread and fresh air. The intelligentsia has always been the conscience of the nation and the moral health of the people has depended on its behavior and its position in critical moments. To speak honestly, it is difficult for me to understand those representatives of the intelligentsia (there are only a few of them, but they do exist) who in this dramatic situation at times forget sober wisdom, and

some people who are not even averse to pouring oil on the fire. The higher national interests of the Armenian people demand an altogether different approach.

The earthquake with all its force showed the determination of our people and their ability to courageously stand up to misfortune. The world never before knew such a stroke of disaster as they were forced to undergo in December. And this relentless stroke did not break the Armenian people. I visit the disaster zone often and meet with people. There are thousands of questions and thousands of problems; many families are housed in tents, and schools are in temporary quarters, and the temperature has fallen to 15-20 degrees below freezing. In general everyone has great problems. But people live on. M. S. Gorbachev, N. I. Ryzhkov, and members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo commission to eliminate the consequences of the earthquake who were in the disaster zone mentioned this tenacity of life and endurance of the Armenian people.

I am proud of my people and their wisdom and endurance in a difficult situation and their desire to direct their efforts and will to the creation and renewal of life. Enormous effort is needed to revive people's spirit and to provide them with an optimistic view of the world. Who if not the intelligentsia should today be together with us in this difficult cause? Spiritual empathy heals no less than medicine; it removes the pain and renews confidence in tomorrow.

We are glad that our intelligentsia is actively entering into all the problems and posing questions which concern the working people and the republic's population. But I would be going against my conscience if today I did not say that questions must not only be posed but that we must together be responsible for the state of affairs. We must not see our mission only in criticizing leadership. We must also bear responsibility for the state of affairs in the republic.

We must all of us work together. And there is one other thing I consider it my duty to say. If we want to have a strong republic, we must have a strong leadership. Strong in the sense of authority. The intelligentsia should have an interest in this. And for its part it should bring to the minds and hearts of the people everything that is positive in the republic's life and reject all the gossip and conjectures about the mythical gap between the leadership and the people which are being spread by persons who do not like the course of renewal which we have taken. These persons are interested in shattering the authority of the leadership; therefore they are making attempts to pass off their wishes as reality.

We are filled with deep faith in the tenacity of our people and their wisdom and ability to manage in a difficult situation and their ability to focus their efforts and will on creativity and constructiveness and the renewal of life, and we are confident of their adherence to the ideas of perestroyka, which carry our destiny.

All of us and all our people must unite to properly overcome the misfortunes which have fallen to the lot of the republic. That is the duty of our generation to the present, the future, and the past.

Kazakh CP CC Discusses Means to Combat Trade Speculation

18300612 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 8 Apr 89 p 1

[KazTAG report under the rubric "At the Kazakh CP Central Committee": "With the Full Force of the Law and the Public"]

[Text] A meeting of the Kazakh CP Central Committee, in which heads of state and legal departments of party obkoms, chiefs of law enforcement agencies and media officials also took part, discussed the issue of combating trade speculation and irregularities in the high-demand goods distribution and retail network.

First quarter results show that the republic's law enforcement agencies and the public continue to mount the effort to stop irregularities in retail trade. Agencies combatting crimes against state property have assigned agents to fight speculation, who carry out extensive preventive and investigative operations.

However, these measures are not uniformly successful. Black market supply channels of high-demand goods are not being properly identified and eliminated. Only the final link of the warehouse-store-speculator criminal chain is usually uncovered. As a result, those who mastermind the crimes often go unpunished. Speculation has also been boosted by a number of newly established cooperatives and video rental stores. One out of four suspects detained by law enforcement agencies for speculation is a college or trade school student. Education of young people should be intensified. The spread of speculation and irregularities in the retail sector are in a large measure due to the breakdown of economic rules. For instance, in the first quarter of the year wages in the republic's economy considerably outpaced labor productivity growth. Speculation also causes distortions in finance and money supply.

Inspections have shown that goods are often accumulated at warehouses and not released into stores for long periods of time, exacerbating the shortages. For instance, at Taldy-Kurgan Oblast's Kazgalantereytorg warehouse 145,000 tons of laundry soap, 150,000 boxes of detergent powder, 8,000 tubes of toothpaste and 13,600 bottles of shampoo were found; those goods were kept off the shelves. The practice of hiding high-demand goods at stores themselves also persists. Illegal trade in alcoholic beverages also continues, especially in large population centers.

The full force of the law should be used against speculators and those who like easy profit. Law enforcement agencies have made proposals to that effect, aimed at

introducing stiffer penalties for minor speculation and resale of goods at higher prices; this should make speculation economically unprofitable.

The republic's mass media makes a contribution to the struggle against speculation. At the KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA editorial offices, a council of workers' inspectors has been formed, functioning jointly with the Kazakh SSR Trade Union Council's workers' inspection commission and its press center. Radio journalists have assumed responsibility for monitoring retail trade at major industrial enterprises: at the Ust-Kamenogorsk titanium and magnesium complex, the Achisayskiy metals complex and the "Alma-Ata Housing Construction Complex" association. OGNI ALATAU, the Alma-Ata oblast newspaper, and the oblast trade union council have formed a consumer protection club. Newspapers LENINSHIL ZHAS and LENINSKAYA SMENA organized hotlines with the participation of the republic's Agency for Combatting Crimes against State Property. The hotline received more than 100 telephone calls and dozens of letters and cables, which formed the basis for raids and inspections on the suspicion of dealing in high-demand goods, spare parts for television sets and automobiles, knitwear and other types of goods. Many newspapers organized raids on flea markets where clothing is sold.

However, most information is provided as ordinary factual reporting, using dry, dispassionate language. It is doubtful that it could help turn public opinion against money-grabbing speculators. We need serious analytical articles by specialists, studies on the nature of shortages and reports by workers' inspectors. They should thoroughly highlight positive experience in combatting speculation and create a climate of intolerance around those who violate retail trade rules and steal state property.

Skillful coordination of the work of law enforcement agencies, volunteer inspectors, trade unions, komsomol and mass media by party organizations should strengthen the struggle against speculation. In this respect, the proposal to set up special detachments to fight speculation at oblast centers and major population centers merits more attention.

The Kazakh CP Central Committee's First Secretary G.V.Kolbin spoke at the meeting.

Tajik Buro Discusses Draft Language Law

18300623 Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TAKZHIKISTANA
in Russian 7 Apr 89 p 1, 2

[TadzhikTA report: "State Language Status for Tajik. From the Expanded Session of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Buro"]

[Text] Prior to being submitted for public discussion, the results of the work of the Commission for Drafting the Language Law were examined at an expanded session of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Buro

held on 5 April in Dushanbe. Discussion of the question was participated in by commission members invited to the meeting, obkom, gorkom, and raykom secretaries, oblispolkom, gorispolkom, and rayispolkom chairmen, heads of ministries, departments, and a number of organizations and institutions, representatives of the creative unions and social organizations, heads and secretaries of the party organizations of higher and secondary specialized educational institutions, senior officials of the apparatuses of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee, the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Tajik SSR Council of Ministers, and representatives of the mass media.

The work of the expanded session of the Buro was participated in by A. Zaramenskiy, deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department, and N. K. Dolgushkin, a senior official in the CPSU Central Committee Department of Party Construction and Cadre Work.

A report on the findings of the work of the Commission for Drafting the Language Law was delivered by Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Chairman G. P. Pallayev, chairman of the Commission for Preparing Proposals Concerning the Status of the State Language in the Tajik SSR and Rules Governing Language Use in the Republic. He noted that the present condition of the Tajik language, and the narrowing of the sphere of its use in party, soviet, and economic organs, education system and cultural bodies, as well as in speech and writing, have brought about the necessity of state protection for the Tajik language.

Proposals and recommendations have come in to the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium from collectives of workers and kolkhoz members, school and vocational-technical school students, college and secondary school students, professors and teaching faculties, associates of scientific-research institutes of the Tajik SSR Academy of Sciences, officials of cultural institutions, the board of the Tajik Writers Union, newspaper, journal, and radio and television editors, and veterans of the party, Komsomol, war, and labor.

As of 1 April 1989, the Tajik SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium had received 7126 letters signed by more than 585,000 citizens, also more than 300 telephone calls. The total added up to more than 74,000 written and oral proposals.

Ninety-nine percent of the signatories demand that state language status be given to Tajik.

The commission held several meetings. At the 21 February meeting it proposed to confer state language status to Tajik and draft a Language Law.

Taking this circumstance into account, the Supreme Soviet Presidium Commission prepared a draft language law consisting of a preamble, four chapters, and totaling 34 articles.

What is the main purpose of the document?

Considering public demands for creating conditions to safeguard and further develop the Tajik language and the culture of the Tajik people, the draft law confers on Tajik the status of state language within the territory of the Tajik SSR.

In doing so, it stipulates that conferring official status on the Tajik language shall in no way diminish or infringe upon the rights of persons whose native language is other than Tajik. This is reflected in the draft law. It states that the Tajik SSR acknowledges and protects the inalienable right of citizens of any nationality to develop their own native language and culture; it protects the equality of all citizens before the law regardless of their native language.

The draft law notes the special status of the Russian language which, since it is the language of interethnic communication in our country, functions freely within the territory of the Tajik SSR.

In connection with this, it is deemed essential to promote the principle of Tajik-Russian and Russian-Tajik bilingualism.

The draft law defines the spheres of use of the Tajik, Russian, Uzbek, and other languages in state and social life, citizens' rights and guarantees in the choice of language, and protection of languages. It calls for state protection and safeguarding of the languages of people living in the territory of GBAO [Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Oblast], also the Yagnob language.

It must be emphasized that the draft law being submitted to your inspection does not regulate the use of languages in daily life, in communication among members of labor collectives, and in institutions and organizations.

A whole chapter of the draft law deals with citizens' rights and guarantees in language choice.

In particular, it stipulates that the Tajik SSR shall guarantee citizens' right independently to choose the language in which they communicate with officials of state government and administration, also enterprises, institutions, and organizations, and to receive from them information and documents in the state language, in Russian, or, to the extent possible, in some other language they choose. It proposes establishing requirements in the sphere of knowledge of the state language and Russian with regard to officials of organs of state authority and administration as well as officials of enterprises and institutions whose duties include regular communication with citizens of various nationalities.

In the section of the draft law which deals with matters of language use, it proposes to stipulate that the state language shall be the language of office work and business correspondence [deloproizvodstvo] and the language of meetings and other workers' conferences in organs of state authority and administration. Citizens who do not know this language have the right to make use of Russian or any other language at meetings and conferences.

In local organs of state authority and administration, office work and business correspondence shall be conducted in the language of the majority of the population living in that territory.

Special mention must be made of documents [akty] of organs of state authority and administration.

At present, the practice in regard to their use is as follows: In the Supreme Soviet Presidium, drafts of ukases are drawn up and adopted in Russian and then translated into Tajik and Uzbek, after which they are published.

Draft laws are adopted in Tajik, Russian, and Uzbek and then published.

In the republic's Council of Ministers, draft decrees are prepared and adopted basically in Russian and are translated into Tajik for publication.

The draft law proposes, on the basis of the official status of the Tajik language, to adopt acts by organs of state authority in Tajik and publish them in the three languages—Tajik, Russian, and Uzbek.

As for office work and correspondence in enterprises, institutions, and organizations of the republic, according to the draft law these should be conducted in Tajik and may be carried out in Russian or some other acceptable language only in enterprises, institutions, and organizations where most of the workers are not speakers of Tajik.

The draft law affirms the present provision of the Tajik SSR Constitution concerning the language of court proceedings—that is, court proceedings must be conducted in the language of the majority population of a given locality, with interpreting provided where necessary.

The draft law proposes to affirm every citizen's guaranteed right (within the republic's capabilities) to receive an education in Tajik, Russian, Uzbek, or some other spoken language, also the opportunity for the Russian population to be taught the Tajik language and for persons of the indigenous nationality to be taught Russian.

The draft law regulates the details of the use of the state language in the sphere of education, science, and culture and stipulates that the state shall promote the study of Tajik literature which is written in Arabic script and the publication of literature in this script.

A separate chapter of the draft law deals with the protection of languages, in particular it stipulates that matters of orthography and terminology in the Tajik standard language shall be codified in accordance with established procedures.

The same chapter also stipulates that the state shall take care to preserve Tajik names and designations.

A special article of the draft law stipulates that persons guilty of violating citizens' rights of language choice, deliberate public disparagement of any language, or distortion in official documents and texts are to be held accountable in accordance with procedures established by law.

The draft Language Law makes it possible to regulate the process of reciprocal bilingualism and multilingualism, to regulate the expedient use of every language in particular spheres of life, and thereby to ensure not only the free and equal functioning of the large and small languages but also, at the same time, to create guarantees for their preservation and further development.

Tajik SSR Minister of Justice Sh. D. Makhmudov read the draft Language Law aloud and made detailed comments on each of its points, engaging in dialogue with participants at the meeting and answering questions from the audience and the presidium. During the course of the discussion, literally every line subject to question or doubt was examined, and editorial amendments were introduced. For example, a heated debate flared up concerning the use of the state language in enterprises and institutions made up of different nationalities. Most agreed that the question as to which language should be used in conducting business should be decided in the labor collectives.

Equally tense was the discussion of the use of the state language in project planning and design work. For example, Central Committee Buro member G. V. Koshlakov asked for the floor and noted that designs of buildings and structures prepared by engineers and architects of Tajikistan, also project-estimate documentation as a whole, are generally intended for the whole country rather than one republic. Does it make sense to translate all design work into the state language? Wouldn't it damage the national interests of the Tajik SSR by holding back scientific-technical progress and the intensive exchange of scientific advances? This was a topic of special concern on the part of heads of design organizations who spoke from the floor. The participants in the

meeting arrived at a unanimous opinion: The commission should be directed to discuss the matter comprehensively with specialists and representatives of design institutes.

Also giving rise to questions were provisions in the draft law concerning the preferential use of the state language in the VUZes, in particular the Tajik Agricultural Institute, the Polytechnical Institute, and the Medical Institute. Most of the participants were in favor of doing additional work on the question and inviting representatives of the VUZes to the commission for the purpose.

The matter of working through the draft Language Law is one of paramount importance. There can be no place for ambiguities, polarized interpretations, or, especially, anything that fails to promote the strengthening of friendship and brotherhood among the representatives of the various nationalities living in Tajikistan. This theme was heard in every statement without exception. Sh. Rustamov, a member of the commission and a corresponding member of the Tajik SSR Academy of Sciences, recounted how carefully and thoroughly the draft had been prepared. This discussion of the draft law, he said, indicates that the commission, the people, and the republic's leadership are unanimous in their opinion that every line in the draft law must be weighed on a finely calibrated scale. As a result, 34 of the 45 articles were submitted to the expanded session for discussion.

A. Tursunov, director of the Oriental Institute of the Republic's Academy of Sciences, emphasized in particular that if the Language Law is adopted and if we emphasize the preservation of unity, then after the document is adopted it will be necessary to discuss it with the people, including the non-Tajik speaking people, and explain it to them.

Critical remarks and proposals with regard to the draft law were expressed by Frunze Raykom First Secretary R. K. Alimov, who spoke in particular about the necessity of striving for precision and uniformity in the wording and the definition of general principles in the use of language in conducting business, also the procedure for passing the law, and also the necessity of proceeding on the basis of directives of the 19th All-Union Party Conference having to do with the nationality question.

Matters concerning the study of the Arabic script, and related efforts of acquainting the people more broadly with the historical and cultural values of the past, were the subject of statements by M. Dinorshoyev, head of the Department of Philosophy of the Tajik SSR Academy of Sciences, and A. Khakimov, editor-in-chief of the weekly ADABIYET VA SAN'AT.

Also sharing their thoughts were M. S. Asimov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; A. Mukhtarov, S. Tabarov, and Professor Khromov, corresponding members of the republic Academy of Sciences; D. Ashurov, head of the ideological department of the

Tajik Communist Party Central Committee; N. Tabarov, Tajik SSR minister of culture; S. Sh. Mirzoshoyev, chairman of the presidium of the Tajik Society for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries; Professor L. V. Uspenskaya; B. Iskandarov, academician of the Tajik SSR Academy of Sciences; G. Ashurov, corresponding member of the republic Academy of Sciences; Professor A. Gafarov; and others.

"We need to get to work on creating an atmosphere of good will around the discussion of the draft Language Law," said Sh. B. Usmanova, a secretary of the Khatlon Obkom. "We cannot work in isolation but must all work together—intelligentsia, party and soviet workers. The commission has done a major, noble job. But the hardest part lies ahead—putting the Law into practice. We must take account of the actual situation and certain statements that are cause for concern, for example to the effect that first we must convert to the state language and then talk.... We must not blame somebody because 6000 poets have been lost; rather, we must ask ourselves why the classic Firdousi, who is accessible to all, is gathering dust on the shelves. In adopting the Law, speaking their mind, or making declarations, our authoritative scientists must have a sense of responsibility for each word, for what role it may play in the minds of unprepared people."

A number of critical remarks, suggestions, and proposals were expressed by numerous other participants in the expanded session of the Central Committee Buro.

The findings of the Buro session were summarized by K. M. Makhkamov, First Secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee. He said:

"As you have learned, the commission has carefully, thoroughly, and comprehensively studied the question, taken account of numerous proposals and requests by the working people, and come to the conclusion that the Tajik language should be given state language status.

"It seems to me that the commission's conclusion is quite well founded. It is no secret to anyone that in recent decades, because of insufficient attention to matters of studying the Tajik language—the language of the immortal works of Rudaki, Firdousi, Abuali ibn Sino, Omar Khayyam, Saadi and Khafiz, Bedil, and Dzhami—the sphere of its use and social functions has become more and more limited.

"Of course, this could not have failed to created entirely understandable concern and disquiet. In consideration of this, in May of last year decrees were adopted on perfecting the study and teaching of the Tajik and Russian languages in the republic.

"In the decree on the Tajik language, party, soviet, trade union, and Komsomol organs, as well as the relevant ministries and departments, pledged, on the basis of strict compliance with Lenin's principle of equal rights

for languages, to ensure the creation of the necessary conditions for the development of the Tajik language and the expansion of its social functions in all spheres of life.

"A number of measures designed to implement the provisions of this decree have been carried out since it was adopted. The population has been given a new textbook of Tajik, a small Tajik-Russian dictionary, Tajik-Russian and Russian-Tajik phrasebooks, and a number of other study materials of that sort.

"The number of hours devoted to the study of Tajik both in Russian and in Tajik classes has been increased. Compulsory study of the Tajik language has been introduced in the educational institutions. Voluntary circles and courses for the study of Tajik have been set up. Tajik language classes are being conducted by means of radio and television. Other steps have also been taken in this direction, but it is probably not necessary to list them.

"Approaching the question in a principled and exacting manner, however, one cannot help noticing that oblast, city, and rayon party committees, primary party organizations, trade unions, the Komsomol, and the relevant ministries and departments have failed to ensure the fulfillment of the adopted decrees to the full extent.

"Moreover, attention to this matter has slackened recently. This could not fail to evoke a corresponding reaction. Scientists and public figures have spoken out in articles expressing concern for the fate of their native language. Numerous letters on this subject have begun to come in to the Central Committee, the republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Commission for the Preparation of the Draft Language Law. None of this could be ignored.

"In emphasizing the correctness and objective character of the commission's conclusions, I should like to focus your attention on certain aspects of the problem. In order to avoid incorrect interpretations and undesirable manifestations, it is essential to understand precisely what is meant by the term 'state language status' and what its adoption means. It is necessary to say at this point that in undertaking to give state language status to the Tajik language we are obligated to create the necessary conditions for its development and expand the sphere of its use.

"We must not, at the same time, forget that conferring state language status on Tajik and taking care of its development do not relieve us of responsibility toward the languages of nations and nationalities living in our republic. In other words, we must not permit any restriction on these languages; we must ensure people's right to use them freely.

"I focus specially on this aspect of the matter because at present some persons have a distorted, incorrect understanding and interpretation of state language status. In

particular, there have been cases of manifestations which do not promote the strengthening of people's friendship. I'm speaking of incidents in the markets, stores, on public transport, and even in certain departments of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], in which certain persons—even though they know Russian—have demanded that citizens address them only in Tajik, otherwise they will refuse to perform their duties. What is happening? In the 73rd year of Soviet rule, our people are suddenly forgetting how to understand one another. Comrades, who needs this?

"Our approach to phenomena of this kind must be resolute and unequivocal: Persons who commit such acts, who deliberately sow discord among people of different nationalities, who attempt to undermine the foundations of friendship and brotherhood of peoples, and who disgrace the Soviet way of life, have no place among us. Such people must be brought to accountability in accordance with the full severity of the law.

"It is essential right now to think seriously about what needs to be done in order to prevent such phenomena, in order to ensure the unshakeability of the foundations of friendship and brotherhood among the peoples of our country.

"Hence, the task now is to ensure that after the draft Language Law is published for public discussion, party, soviet, trade union, and Komsomol organizations, aided by the public at large—especially scientists, literary figures, and artists—immediately set about to explain every point of the draft Law in the labor collectives, in people's places of residence, and among young people in school. This must be done with special tact, understanding, and conviction.

"We highly and uniformly appreciate the friendship and brotherhood of all the nations and nationalities of our Motherland and are sincerely respectful of the language of every one of them. Nevertheless, I have to say something about the fraternal Russian people, about the special role and significance of the Russian language. In looking back over the historical path we have traversed, speaking from a position of honor, conscience, and justice, we cannot rightly forget that the fraternal Russian people have played an eminent role in the fate of the peoples of our Motherland, including the fate of the ancient Tajik people.

"How can we forget the fact that the best sons of the Russian people were among the first teachers, physicians, and researchers into the history, language, and literature of the Tajik people? Can we expunge from our memory the fact that they, along with Tajiks and representatives of other peoples, gave their lives in the struggle for the establishment and consolidation of Soviet rule in Tajikistan, for our happiness and freedom?

"And can we imagine our life today without the fruitful and effective cooperation of the Soviet republics and fraternal peoples? I think we have grounds for profound contemplation of these matters and for explaining to anyone who does not understand it, especially young people, the essence and Leninist principles of the friendship, brotherhood, and comprehensive cooperation of the peoples of the Land of the Soviets.

"Above all this must be brought to the attention of those people who, through their irresponsible actions, have cast a shadow on our friendly and hospitable people.

"Now, about the Russian language. I think there is no need to explain the place, role, and significance of the Russian language in the life of our multinational state.

"For this reason, if we, like representatives of the other fraternal peoples, sincerely wish to be among the developed nations of the world and stride along the path of progress, along with a good and excellent knowledge of our own native language we must know how to speak and write fluently in Russian, the acknowledged language of interethnic communication in this country.

"Everyone is aware today, after all, that because of a poor knowledge of the Russian language we do not have enough qualified cadres in high-priority sectors of science and technology. Because of this, some of our young people cannot study successfully in the country's leading educational institutions and they come up against considerable difficulties while serving in the ranks of the Armed Forces.

"We must pay more attention to the study of Russian also because almost 70 percent of the republic's population live in the villages, in an environment of purely Tajik nationality. Under such conditions, unless the necessary attention is paid to the study of Russian along with the native language in the schools, it is hard to imagine that the situation will improve.

"In connection with the matter being discussed today, I should like to say a few words about internationalism and internationalist upbringing. Experience shows that until recently we did not realize the full complexity and depth of the problem. There were those who assumed that the mere existence of multinational oblasts, cities, rayons, and labor collectives was sufficient to establish and internationalist outlook.

"Unquestionably, living and working together attests to the internationalist character of our life. It seems to me, however, that this is just one side of the matter. Real, genuine internationalism, in its Leninist sense, begins only when the representatives of different nations and nationalities manifest sincere concern for one another and nourish a sense of mutual respect for the language, culture, way of life, and customs of their comrades in labor, when equal rights in all spheres of life are ensured.

"It is essential that party, soviet, trade union, and Komsomol organs, as well as economic officials, focus constant attention on this aspect of internationalist upbringing from now on.

"As regards the draft Language Law, I should like to add that after the draft has been discussed publicly it will undoubtedly be improved. In my opinion, Article 33 needs to be made stronger and more precise.

"In conclusion I should like to request that the chairman and members of the commission prepare the draft Language Law, in two weeks' time, taking account of the comments and proposals of the comrades here, for public discussion, to be conducted in the course of three months' time.

"But this does not exhaust the matter. Very difficult work lies ahead in regard to working out practical measures to ensure actual enactment of state language status.

"First, we need to deal with the financing of the matter. One-time expenditures on the additional publication of textbooks, the article on public education, and the translation of office work and business papers into the native language and other items alone will add up to about 80 million rubles, and after that, tens and maybe even hundreds of millions of rubles will be needed for these purposes every year. We need to think about what sources will be drawn upon to finance all of this.

"Then we need to determine the sequence of stages and timetables for the implementation of measures designed to ensure the functioning of the state language—for example, expanding the printing facilities base, the technical equipping of educational institutions and the preparation of schoolbooks, teaching of the Tajik language to various categories of officials, translating business papers into the state language where this is called for, training translators, typists, and stenographers, providing the necessary printing devices and office equipment, providing for simultaneous interpreting, and much, much more.

"It would appear necessary to ensure that during the three months in which the Language Law is being discussed, the republic Council of Ministers prepare a draft program of these measures in order to submit it to the session of the Supreme Soviet along with the draft Language Law.

"Overall, it looks this way: We must carry out all the preparatory measures in 1.5 years of the current five-year plan, and we must begin the systematic, step-by-step adoption of the state language during the 13th Five-Year Plan.

"You can see, comrades, that we all have a lot of work to do. It will require concerted, joint, and well coordinated efforts on the part of all of us.

"In conclusion allow me, on behalf of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee Buro, to thank all members of the commission, who have devoted a great deal of effort and time to the preparation of the draft law we have examined."

The Central Committee Buro gave its overall approval to the draft Language Law and recommended that the commission work to improve it on the basis of the comments and proposals that were expressed while it was being discussed and publish it for public discussion.

Ligachev Tashkent Speech

18001121 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
13 May 89 p 1-2

[Unattributed report on speech by Ye. K. Ligachev at the Tashkent Meeting: "Direct Ties Are Beneficial to the City and the Village; date not specified]

[Text] At the March (1989) Central Committee Plenum, in M. S. Gorbachev's report and the adopted resolutions, a task of special importance was set up: to eliminate in the very near future the acuteness of the food-production problem and, during the 13th Five-Year Plan, to ensure the production of agricultural products in a quantity and assortment adequate for a stable food supply.

We are embarking upon the solution of this problem with a number of favorable factors at hand. First of all, we have a modern agrarian policy with its basic directions, means and methods of realization fully elaborated. The Central Committee Plenum has confirmed the socialist path for the development of agriculture. We have an integrated program for solving the food-production question.

Recognition has been given to the diversity and equality of all forms of socialist property and all forms of management and to their interaction. Broad rights have been granted to all types of agriculture, groundless limitations on their development have been removed, responsibility for the final results of the work has been increased and the people's initiative has been unleashed. During my recent visit to Kaluga Oblast, one resident of the village of Kozla said: "Now the peasant has been given greater leeway and things will start to happen."

Further, the realization of the resolutions adopted by the March Central Committee Plenum is occurring during the period of the restructuring of all spheres of society and of their democratization. This is a favorable factor. The fact is, the development of the agrarian sector depends to a large extent on economic and political reform.

In society, more so than at any time in the recent past, the opinion has come of age that the food-production problem is the most urgent A-1 priority. This is very important.

And finally, the production and intellectual potential of the cities has become more completely involved in the strengthening of the agroindustrial complex's material and technical base and the defense industry has joined in on a large scale. All of this is favorable to the realization of the agrarian policy.

At the same time, the practical implementation of the contemporary agrarian policy is being conducted under difficult conditions. The crisis features of the economic structure are becoming known, as are the profound lag in machine building, the complicated situation of the financial sector, the disordered monetary circulation and the acute shortage of consumer goods.

Personal incomes are increasing two to two and a half times faster than the amount of goods. Of course, it is difficult to keep up with this rate and saturate the market with foodstuffs.

During the first 3 years of the current five-year plan, the production of the country's agricultural output has increased by 9 percent in comparison with the previous five-year plan's corresponding period: grain by 14 percent, meat and milk by 10-12 percent. Meanwhile, society has not perceived this supplement, as it is called. Whereas, in the first half of the '80's, personal incomes rose annually by 14-15 billion rubles, in 1988, they rose by nearly 40 billion rubles and, for the first four months of this year, by 16 billion rubles.

Further, it is also necessary to keep in mind the following. For the 13th Five-Year Plan, it is intended that there be an increase in the production of foodstuffs by 26-30 percent with an increase in capital investments in the agroindustrial complex [APK] of 19 percent. Such a ratio between the growth of production and the increase in capital investments has never occurred in a single five-year plan. Thus, it is necessary to increase substantially the yield of the APK's production potential, on the one hand, and to change the structure of the investments in the APK and to attract other sources of material and financial resources, on the other.

In talking about the conditions under which we are beginning the implementation of the contemporary agrarian policy and the current food-production plans, it is impossible not to mention that, this year, in the production of livestock output, we have started with a zero increase.

With regards to Central Asia, Siberia and the Urals, the situation regarding purchases of meat and milk is as follows. Uzbekistan, Kirghizia and Turkmenistan have produced a substantial increase, while Tajikistan, Buryatia and Kemerovo Oblast have reduced the volumes of meat and milk purchases. Less milk than last year has been sold to the state in Bashkiria and Perm and Chelyabinsk oblasts.

In brief, under complicated conditions, the party has taken upon itself the responsibility of ensuring in the next few years a stable food supply for the country.

In order to implement what has been planned, it is necessary, by the end of the 13th Five-Year Plan, to increase the production of grain, meat and milk by approximately 25-30 percent, vegetables by 34 percent, potatoes by 44 percent and fruits, berries and grapes by a factor of more than 2. Doing this will not be simple. There is a lot of work ahead. Not a single day can be lost because time is pressing us hard.

In order to make fuller use of all the sources for reinforcement of food resources, zonal seminar meetings have been conducted in the cities of Omsk, Brest, Stavropol and Kaluga. At them, the questions of cost accounting and leasing considerations, the expansion of the cooperative system between industrial and agricultural enterprises and the development of family farms and truck farm cooperatives have been examined in particular.

We also attach great importance to today's meeting in Central Asia. Its goal is the further development of direct economic ties between the oblasts, the industrial enterprises, the kolkhozes and sovkhozes and the consumers cooperatives of the Russian Federation and, in particular, of Moscow, Siberia and the Urals, on the one hand, and the Central Asian republics, on the other.

Even during the first years of Soviet Power, a lot of attention was paid to the development of economic ties between Central Asia and Siberia. It was for this purpose that the Turkistan-Siberian Railroad was constructed (Turksib).

What is being discussed today? The joining of the efforts of the labor collectives of industry, agriculture and consumers cooperatives in order to increase the production of foodstuffs, in particular, vegetables, fruits and potatoes using the advantages of the interrepublic division of labor and the cooperative system.

We have had similar experience. Starting with the resolutions of the March and April Central Committee plenums, today it is important to impart to all these processes a more systematic, constant and large-scale nature. This is the first thing. And the second is that the direct economic ties should be built on the principles of equality, mutual benefit, an equivalent basis and commodity-money relations. Such an approach agrees completely with the initiated perestroika of the management of the economic structure and the social sphere in the union republics based on self-management and self-financing.

Also no less important is the social aspect of the matter. The increase in the production volumes of produce and its immense inter-regional exchange produce an opportunity for improving the food supply and raising the

standard of living for the populace of all the republics, for reinforcing the economic structure of the kolkhozes and sovkhozes and their financial situation, for expanding the sources of accumulations and for more rational use of labor and material resources.

Also great is the political significance of the development of the cooperative system between the oblasts, krays and republics, as well as the economic ties between industrial and agricultural enterprises. A deepening of the division and cooperative system of labor between the republics, krays and oblasts also strengthens the economic bases for harmonizing interethnic relations. Undoubtedly, this has a positive effect on the development of fraternal relations between the republics, the exchange of experience and spiritual values and the interethnic education of the workers.

Thus, the inter-republic economic cooperation and the development of direct ties between the industrial and agricultural enterprises are inherently inscribed in the radical economic reform and in the restructuring of the political system. This is an important link in the broad-scale program for the renewal of all aspects of life of Soviet society.

Now some more details about improving supplying the populace with fruit, vegetables and potatoes. The contemporary level of development of potato cultivation, vegetable cultivation and gardening does not ensure the fulfillment of this task. Over the last 3 years, a drop has been noted to the level attained in the previous five-year plan. The shortfall in the satisfaction of the consumption standard amounts to 40 kg of vegetables and 20 kg of fruit for each inhabitant of the country.

For an extended amount of time now, we have been forced to resort to the importation of a large quantity of fruits and, in individual years, of potatoes. Thus, the import of fruits amounts to 670,000 tons or 15 percent of their gross harvest in the country.

And the matter here is not only the low harvests of potatoes, fruits and vegetables, but also the fact that a significant part of the produce grown is spoiled during harvesting, transport and storage. The losses amount to 20 percent and more. The kolkhozes and sovkhozes which specialize in the production of potatoes, vegetables and fruits should have processing shops and modern facilities for storing the produce. How is this problem to be solved?

Uzbekistan, Kirghizia, Turkmenia and Tajikistan make up a unique region for the conducting of southern fruit and vegetable cultivation in the country. Here, every fifth ton of grapes is purchased and every sixth of vegetables and 40 percent of the melons stocked in the country.

Central Asia is a large supplier of early fruit and vegetable products to the country's industrial centers in fresh form. The specific percentage of the deliveries from here of this produce amounts to 25 percent of the vegetables, 55 percent of the grapes and nearly 60 percent of the melons union-wide. From the plan this year for the deliveries of 1,835,000 tons of fruits and vegetables, the city of Moscow will receive 250,000 tons and the 14 Russian Federation oblasts participating in the meeting will receive nearly 840,000 tons.

The Central Asian republics, as a rule, are reliable partners. They are fulfilling their obligations for deliveries. Long-term business ties have been established between the majority of produce suppliers and receivers. In their own turn, many regions of Siberia are supplying the indicated region with potatoes, confections and consumer goods.

Have the possibilities of the Central Asian republics for increasing fruit and vegetable production been exhausted? As analysis shows, the region's possibilities are far from being used completely. Let us take as an example the Tashkent Oblast. Here, over the last 5 years, the population has increased by 500,000 people. It would seem that the oblast's leaders should adopt measures to increase the production of fruits and vegetables. However, in the current five-year plan, the production and consumption of this produce is being reduced.

Consequently, not only do the receivers of union-wide stocks have an interest in increasing the production of fruits and vegetables, but also local inhabitants. We are talking about satisfying the needs for potatoes, fruits and vegetables of the population of all the republics.

In Central Asia, it is important to ensure the production of cotton, its high quality and a maximum fiber yield. At the same time, it is necessary to increase here the production of livestock products and to achieve an increase in per capita consumption of milk and meat, as well as fruits and vegetables.

We will tell you straight out that, until recently, the production of fruits and vegetables here has been poorly developed. The specialization of farms for the production of fruits and vegetables is being underrated. The sector's infrastructure is weak. For all practical purposes, there is a lack of a goods-transportation network for deliveries to the union-wide stocks—sorting and packing shops and storage warehouses near the stations, with preliminary refrigeration. This work will be revitalized, first of all, in Turkmenia.

The consumers cooperative system has turned out to be apart from the establishment of a preparation and processing base. The Uzbek and Tajik republic consumers unions have constructed in the capitals monumental administrative buildings for the management staff, but there has been practically little concern about the development of a network of contemporary enterprises for

receiving, storing and processing fruits and vegetables. And, if you add to this the fact that trains move slowly, then it becomes understandable why a significant part of the fruits and vegetables delivered to Moscow, Siberia and the Urals are of poor quality and sometimes spoiled. And even in the storage process, a lot of the produce delivered over thousands of kilometers is spoiled.

Why is understandable. In the Uzbek, Turkmen and Tajik union republics, the provided storage facilities for potatoes, fruits and vegetables amounts to less than 30 percent of what is needed and, in the Kirghiz union republic, to 33 percent. In the Altay Kray and the Bashkir Autonomous Republic, it is less than 50 percent and, in Novosibirsk Oblast, 30 percent. There is a shortage of storage facilities in the Kemerovo and Sverdlovsk oblasts, in the Krasnoyarsk Kray and in the Buryat Autonomous Republic. Only just barely has Tyumen Oblast been provided with enough storage facilities.

Recently, this region's republics worked out a program for the development of fruit and vegetable complexes. A significant increase in production at the kolkhozes and sovkhozes is being proposed, as well as the establishment of the necessary infrastructure. Substantial measures are being adopted by the USSR Ministry of Railways, Aeroflot, and motor vehicle transport. Plans have been made to involve military transport aviation. But, as before, there is a lot of criticism of transport organizations regarding the delivery of potatoes and vegetables to Moscow and the large cities of the country. Railroad workers, aviators and motor vehicle drivers are henceforth responsible completely for the quality of produce delivered. And they should build their own work with the consumers and the suppliers on the basis of the purchase and sale of the produce and the material responsibility for its maintenance.

The matter of the prices for potatoes, fruits, vegetables and grapes is being handled in a different manner. In conformity with the resolutions of the March CPSU Central Committee Plenum, already by next year, the purchasing of fruits and vegetables according to contracted prices will have been developed, which is of material interest to farms in increasing the production of high-quality produce and its timely delivery to the consumer.

As has been shown by the conducting of group seminar meetings in Omsk, Brest, Stavropol and Kaluga, the family farms and gardening and marketing cooperatives have available an enormous reserve for the production of potatoes, vegetables and fruits. It must be assumed that everything valuable with which you become acquainted at the seminars will be put to use by you, as they say. And already this year, through public production, the family farms and the gardening and marketing associations, the republics, oblasts and krays will receive an appreciable supplement of meat, milk, potatoes, vegetables and fruits.

Our country represents a united economic complex with an established inter-republic division of labor, including agricultural. Russia, for example, has been engaged since ancient times in potato cultivation, while the Central Asian republics have engaged in the production of fruits and vegetables. There is an on-going exchange of these products between the RSFSR and the Central Asian republics.

How, then, are the oblasts and krais of Siberia and the Urals fulfilling their obligations to the fraternal Central Asian republics for deliveries of potatoes?

In the current five-year plan, the Russian Federation is fulfilling the plan for the delivery of potatoes to Central Asia by only half and Bashkiria and Kurgan, Novosibirsk and Perm oblasts by even less—4-17 percent of the planned quota. Kemerovo, Omsk and Tomsk oblasts are doing so by 40-45 percent. As you see, state discipline in the deliveries of potatoes in the RSFSR is low, which is intolerable and must be decisively corrected.

New forms of economic cooperation between the Siberian and Central Asian oblasts are becoming widespread in the supplying of potatoes to the populace of the Central Asian republics.

As is well known, in Central Asia, there is a large surplus of labor resources. This is used in the development of mutually beneficial ties. For example, Fergana Oblast concluded an agreement on cooperation with the Khakass Autonomous Oblast in Krasnoyarsk Kray. On the basis of this agreement, 150 people were sent from Fergana Oblast farms to Khakassia, who, under the terms of a lease, set about growing potatoes in an area of 1,200 hectares [almost 3,000 acres]. All the potatoes from this area will go into the farm's plan, but, in conformity with the agreement's conditions, they are planned to be shipped for the populace of Fergana Oblast.

A similar agreement has been concluded between Khorezm and Chita oblasts. Under lease terms, 600 kolkhoz workers from Khorezm Oblast will grow potatoes on Chita Oblast farms in an area of 5,000 hectares [about 12,000 acres]. The potatoes grown from this area will go to improve the food supply of the Khorezm Oblast workers.

Other forms of direct economic ties between republics, oblasts, kolkhozes and sovkhoses of various regions of the country are being developed. I have already mentioned that the country's agroindustrial complex, in order to ensure an increase in the production of foodstuffs by 30 percent with an increase in capital investments of 19 percent, needs additional sources of material and financial resources. The cooperative system of industry and the rural area serves this matter well. Besides, this is beneficial for both the city dwellers and the rural folk.

An example of this are the economic relations between the USSR Ministry of the Petroleum Industry's enterprises and Uzbekistan's Surkhan-Darya Oblast. The oil workers of Western Siberia, Tataria, Bashkiria, Perm Oblast and other oil-drilling centers are associated with the farms of this oblast on a mutually beneficial basis. Still, it is necessary to keep in mind the fact that all large petroleum industry enterprises, just like those of the coal industry and machine building, have their own rural farms, which are engaged basically in the production of meat and milk. And, along with this, they are entering into a cooperative system with the kolkhozes and sovkhoses of the Central Asian republics.

The task of party, soviet and trade union organizations and the soviets of the labor collectives consists of supporting in every way possible the movement initiated for the development of direct ties between industry and agriculture, of creating for this purpose the necessary conditions and, on this basis, of obtaining a supplement to the food supply in the country.

There are quite a few similar types of examples. Practice shows that certain principles should be observed here.

First. In the agreement for cooperation in the growing and delivery of produce, it is necessary to make provision for the participation of the industrial enterprises through financial and material resources within the framework of the rights granted to them. Naturally, it is impossible to permit the use for this purpose of the material and technical resources intended for fulfillment of the contractual obligations for deliveries of the output produced by the enterprise and the association.

Second. The long-term nature of the agreement. In sharing in the original and current investments, it is important that the industrial enterprise have a guarantee for the long-term receipt of the produce, as the economists say, over the entire period of amortization of the established assets.

Third. The economic ties between the oblasts and the republics, as well as between the enterprises, kolkhozes and sovkhoses, must be built on a strictly voluntary basis. The agreements they have must be direct ones, without a lot of middlemen or a swollen apparatus. Of course, this does not preclude the sensible mediation of the commercial purchasing associations of the agricultural industry or the consumers cooperatives.

In talking about the development of direct ties, it is impossible to forget that they should be implemented through an additional increase in the production of potatoes, fruits and vegetables and not to the detriment of the union-wide stocks. Here there should be strong state discipline.

Yet, the possibilities for increasing the production of fruits and vegetables and supplying them to the populace are truly enormous.

I, together with a group of comrades, managed to visit Surkhan-Darya Oblast. This unique region of the country for the cultivation of early fruits and vegetables has the necessary conditions for the organization of the production and delivery to the country's industrial centers of more than 1 million tons of vegetables. Unfortunately, these possibilities are not being exploited now. Similar reserves are possessed by the many Central Asian republics for increasing the production of early vegetables and unique southern fruits, which are continuing to be imported into the country.

An important place in improving supplying the populace with foodstuffs, including potatoes, fruits and vegetables, belongs to the consumers cooperative system. Here it is necessary to seize on the development of a network of processing centers. Preferably, right at the kolkhozes and sovkhozes, i.e., placing the processing as close as possible to the production sites. The matter has come to the point that the basic amount of fruit and vegetable canned goods consumed in Siberia and the Central Asian republics are being brought in from other regions of the country. Is this really good management? This is frequently explained by a shortage of equipment for processing. It is possible and necessary to organize the production of food-processing equipment locally, without expecting to receive it in a centralized procedure. For the time being, in Uzbekistan, all told, only 30 farms are operating processing shops and, in Tajikistan, only 3.

It must be noted that even the established production potential for processing fruits and vegetables is not being exploited fully. In the Kirghiz consumers union, for example, the load on the storage facilities and the refrigeration capacities for fruits and vegetables remains at the level of 50 percent. And this is with their chronic shortage.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the situation in the rural area is being changed substantially. Undoubtedly, this will have a wholesome effect on the mood of the city dwellers. The large-scale socioeconomic, organizational and political measures worked out at the March CPSU Central Committee Plenum are creating favorable conditions for the efficient operation of kolkhozes and sovkhozes and all APK enterprises and for an accelerated increase in the production of foodstuffs. The main thing now is to use them skillfully, to promote organizational work, to draw in all the sources of food resources and to strive for the active participation of the labor collectives of the villages and the cities in the solution of the food supply problem.

UzSSR: First Secretary Nishanov on Regional Economic Ties

18300646 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
14 May 89 p 1-2

[Unattributed report on speech by R.N. Nishanov at the meeting in Tashkent: "Reinforcing Direct Ties"]

[Text] Dear comrades!

Please allow me, first of all, on behalf of the Uzbek CP Central Committee Buro, to extend a cordial welcome to all of you, our dear guests and friends in this common causes, and to wish you fruitful work, good impressions, and new achievements in the further strengthening and development of interregional ties and cooperation within the confines of our country's single national-economic complex on a mutually advantageous, completely equivalent basis.

The conducting in Tashkent of such a broad and representative meeting with the participation of Ye. K. Ligachev, a number of responsible workers from the center, our neighbors from the Central Asian republics, as well as our partners from Moscow and a number of krais and oblasts in the Urals, Siberia, and the Altay is viewed by us as a graphic example of the concrete practical work of the commission of the party's Central Committee in achieving the goals of the March and April 1989 Plenums of the CPSU Central Committee.

As Comrade M. S. Gorbachev has emphasized, the decisions of the March Plenum mean not only a cardinal restructuring of the party's agrarian policy, but also the illumination from new positions of the problem of the further integration of the country's industrial and agroindustrial complexes and a sharp intensification of the aid providing to agriculture in raising the scientific-technical level of production and in the social transformation of the rural areas.

In this regard the establishment of direct, mutually advantageous, long-term ties among the oblasts, rayons, agroassociations and firms, and farms in the republic with the large-scale industrial subdivisions in the other parts of the country is an effective measure that is directed at further industrialization and agroindustrial integration and at the improvement of the supplying of our regions with food products.

Uzbekistan, like the other Central Asian republics, in addition to cotton specialization, is a very large producer and supplier of fruits, vegetables, and melon crops. Moreover, these are products which, by virtue of our natural and climatic conditions, possess especially valuable, and one might use unique, nutritional qualities. Therefore we view these products as our main contribution to resolving the Food Program. Without desiring to recall the unpleasant features of the past, but in order not to repeat its errors, it is necessary to say once again today that in the race for cotton giantism the development of fruit and vegetable production, as well as other branches of the food complex, was artificially held back and shifted into the background. That had an extremely detrimental effect on the republic's economy and on supplying the republic's rapidly growing population with food products, restrained the possibilities of our shipments to other regions, undermined the fertility of the land, and caused large ecological complications and the disbalance of the water resources.

With the daily assistance and support of the CPSU Central Committee and the country's government, we have been working persistently to eliminate these distortions and disproportions. Cotton-growing is being shifted to a scientific agrotechnical basis; the single-crop emphasis on cotton, which had literally been stifling our agriculture, is being eliminated; work is being done persistently to introduce crop rotations; and there has been a re-examination of the investment policy in water-management construction—a large part of the capital investments is being channeled into improving the quality of the land. Major measures are being carried out to achieve the accelerated development of the food-producing branches.

But the most important thing is that there has been a thorough restructuring of the entire economic mechanism of the agroindustrial complex, as of the country's entire economy. Despite all the variety and equality of the forms and methods of these reforms, they have a single goal—the goal of making the worker the real owner of production, of returning to the peasant his heartfelt tie with the land.

To do this, the favorable conditions have currently been created. We are convinced that the fundamental improvement of the production relations in the rural areas; the changeover to economic methods of administration; the introduction of efficient forms of management, and primarily of rent, and of production cooperatives; the improvement of price establishment; and the establishment of equivalent exchange between agriculture and industry will provide a good impetus to accelerating the development of the entire agroindustrial complex.

The republic is carrying out realistic measures to expand rental relations and to increase the production of output in private plots, orchard and truck-farm associations, and the subsidiary plots of industrial enterprises. There has been an increase in the number of kolkhozes and sovkhozes where all the brigades and teams have been converted to the rental contract. Industrial enterprises of the republic's Gosagroprom and the service organizations are also changing over to rental conditions. A search is under way for new forms, and firms, associations, and cooperatives that operate under a system of cost accountability are being formed. In the intensification of these processes we see the primary task of the republic's party, soviet, and economic agencies.

All this has a beneficial effect on the state of affairs. Purposeful measures are being carried out in cotton-growing and animal husbandry, and in developing the production of vegetables and melon crops, orchards, and vineyards. As a result, the production of fruits and vegetables has increased, and has reached 5.2 million tons. During the first three years of the five-year plan, 3.9 million tons of fruits and vegetables were delivered to the unionwide fund. That is almost 500,000 tons more than was stated in the plan.

But these are only the first ships, the first steps, which do not satisfy either the republic's needs or, much less, the country's. In carrying out many of the problems that became serious long ago, we have been allowing ourselves to move slowly. I have in mind first of all the low harvest yield of vegetable crops and fruit plantings in almost all the republic's oblasts. And yet, in our abundant land, where serious frosts are almost nonexistent, it is possible, if one takes the correct, efficient approach, to grow valuable vegetable produce in a broad variety.

Many farms in Surkhan-Darya, Syr-Darya, Samarkand, and other oblasts grow grain crops on irrigated land, although that land yields only 1000 rubles of income per hectare. The conversion of this land to the growing of vegetable crops would bring the farms 8000-10,000 rubles of net profit per hectare.

Life persistently demands the turning of our attention to the growing of fruits and vegetables, and the taking of decisive steps to increase the yield from each hectare. This requires improving the structure of the sown areas and achieving more rapidly the rated harvest yield on the virgin lands, which are being used unsatisfactorily today.

Another powerful level for achieving an upsurge in fruit and vegetable production is the conversion of that production to a new economic basis. With the introduction of contract prices, the branch has been acquiring realistic and rather reliable material incentives for development: for the time being, the wholesale purchase prices for fruit and vegetable output to be delivered to the unionwide fund are purely symbolic.

As an important reserve both for developing fruit and vegetable production in the republic and for improving the supplying of food products both to our own population and also to the residents of Moscow and of the major industrial centers of the Urals, Siberia, and the Altay, we are considering the establishment of direct, mutually advantageous, long-term ties. The first experiment has indicated the promising nature of this approach. The chief principle and the chief advantage here are the direct mutually advantageous exchanges of those resources that our regions have at their disposal, bypassing the cumbersome barriers and confused labyrinths of the planning and supply organizations.

The type of cooperation that seems to be the most effective is the type when, in exchange for fruits and vegetables, we receive equipment and articles for the development of the branch itself. For example, a number of farms in Syr-Darya Oblast have contracted with enterprises of Krasnoyarsk and Khabarovsk krais and the cities of Sverdlovsk, Chelyabinsk, and Barnaul concerning reciprocal direct shipments, in exchange for fruits and vegetables, of rolled metal and equipment for the food industry. On the Pobeda Kolkhoz, Bekabadskiy Rayon, enterprises of Novosibirsk will build a canned-goods shop, part of the output of which will be shipped to those enterprises on an earmarked basis.

The ties that the petroleum producers of the Urals and Siberia have with the farms in Surkhan-Darya Oblast are quite impressive. The people in the Urals and Siberia delivered to those farms various construction materials and equipment with a total value of 40 million rubles. The construction workers of Ulyanovsk Oblast have concluded a contract and have begun the construction of vegetable and fruit storage facilities, a production entity for the processing of sheepskins, and a sausage shop in Bukhara Oblast.

Examples of efficient cooperation with workers in the fraternal republics, and especially the RSFSR, can be found today in practically any oblast in Uzbekistan. For three years, direct ties have existed between the labor collectives of Khorezm and Chita oblasts. The agricultural and construction entities in Siberia employ more than 600 kolkhoz members and sovkhoz workers from Khorezm. Recently our countrymen contracted with representatives of Saratov, Kostroma, and Ulyanovsk oblasts, RSFSR, and Vitebsk Oblast, BSSR—in those oblasts they rented 18,000 hectares of land in order to grow potatoes and vegetables. Reciprocal pledge-contracts for shipments of output in excess of plan are currently being formalized.

The workers of Fergana Oblast decided to open up in Khakass Autonomous Oblast, RSFSR, stores to sell fresh vegetables, fruits, and grapes. In exchange the workers in Fergana will receive from Khakassia potatoes and lumber.

The workers of Kashka-Darya, Tashkent, Andizhan, and Bukhara oblasts and Karakalpak ASSR gave a rather broad geography of economic ties. They ship vegetables, fruits, and melon crops to 17 oblasts, krais, and autonomous republics in RSFSR. In exchange for this produce, the labor collectives of RSFSR have already shipped to Uzbekistan a large amount of lumber, cement, slate, rolled metal, pipes, coal, and prefabricated homes.

These new forms of the economic cooperation between our organizations and the workers of Moscow, the Urals, Siberia, the Altay, and the Non-Chernozem Zone—forms that have been engendered by life itself—have been proving their effectiveness.

Today we will have to establish additional direct ties, to conclude contracts with oblasts, rayons, and farms for mutually advantageous shipments. At such time, in our opinion, we must observe reciprocal commercial interest; all the settlements must be made on the prices that have been agreed upon, with a consideration of the retail prices at the places where the produce is sold. Obviously, the priority must be given to those exchange operations in the course of which the needs of both sides are satisfied. For example, we have an acute need of lumber, because the suppliers of it (incidentally, in the regions

that have been mentioned) have failed to ship 400,000 cubic meters, or 38 percent of the planned lumber, including 245,000 cubic meters on limit.

But the chief preference should be given to the means for developing the fruit and vegetable branch itself—equipment for hothouses and film-type coverings; refrigeration units for storage, especially at loading sites; lines and equipment for processing fruits and vegetables; small-sized canned-goods shops; and various shapes of pipes. In resolving the questions of the social reorganization of the rural areas, we have a serious need for equipment for baking bricks. Contracts for direct shipments of commodity goods, especially furniture and complicated household appliances, have not been precluded.

Taking advantage of the presence of the administrators from a number of important union agencies, I would like to express a number of considerations that would promote the active development of such ties.

As we were convinced yesterday when we visited various projects, one of the sore points that require cardinal resolution not only in the organizing of contractual ties, but also of all shipments of fruits and vegetables, is the procurement and transporting of the produce. Today, factually speaking, no one is really responsible for this—not the procurement organizations, the transportation organizations, or the trade organizations. A correct statement about this was made here by Ye. K. Ligachev. And all this confusion lies as a heavy material burden on the producer. But the losses that he bears sometimes are as much as 30 percent or more of the total output produced.

That is why, in the contracts being concluded, it is necessary to stipulate precisely who will engage, and how, in the acceptance of the fruit and vegetable produce and in its further transportation. With a consideration of the distances to be covered, it would be desirable in a number of instances to stipulate ahead of time the use of aviation, the use of the consumer-enterprises' own refrigerator means, and also the costs of air shipments. In general, we shall have to move more quickly: as last year's experience has shown, the initiative can be seized by numerous members of cooperatives who display enviable energy and, as the expression go, do not stand on the price.

And, finally, a few words about using contractual relations in order to establish broader and more varied ties in the other spheres. We are discussing, as strange as this may seem, the improvement of the supplying of our population with food products. First of all, with potatoes, the state shipments of which from the oblasts that have been assigned to the republic have been disrupted from year to year. Last year, for example, we had an undershipment of approximately 270,000 tons of potatoes, which constitutes 30 percent of the planned quantity. This is the main reason for the republic's low indicators for per-capita consumption of food products.

And, of course, it would be possible to leave out of the competition the exchanges for meat and dairy products, the republic's needs for which cannot be satisfied by relying on its own forces.

In the course of preparing the contracts it is necessary to work out various alternatives. In particular, such alternatives as those when the republic's farms would rent land in other regions to produce potatoes and certain other crops, and the produced output would be divided on mutually advantageous terms. I think that, within the confines of direct ties, new prospects open up for expanding the training of worker cadres for the developing branches of industry in Central Asia.

Our meeting is being held under conditions when in Uzbekistan, as in the other Central Asian republics, as a result of frosts and precipitation that are unprecedented at this time, almost two-thirds of the plantings of cotton and other crops have been damaged or killed. The losses caused by the forces of nature are estimated to be approximately 800 billion rubles.

Today all the efforts and all the material resources have been mobilized to eliminate the consequences of the natural calamity. We are confronted by the task not only of bringing in the largest possible harvest during the current year, but also of doing everything necessary to increase it during subsequent years.

It is precisely in this situation that one observes the testing of the consolidation, the integrational force, the unity and friendship, and, I would say, the political unity of our country. It is with a sense of profound pride that we accept assistance from the fraternal republics and various regions.

The calamity that has overtaken the Central Asian republics presents such questions as the allocation by union agencies of interest-free credit; lump-sum assistance; the introduction of changes in the planned indicators for shipments of fruits and vegetables; the additional allocation of fuels and lubricants; the granting of long-term credit for construction; nonrepayable financial assistance to the public and renters; and the increase in the approved limits for water use. I would also like to have more attention paid to our misfortunes on the part of the Gosstrakh agencies. This is necessary for the most rapid correction of the situation.

At the present time it is obvious that it will not be possible to give compensation in full volume for the losses. In this regard, during the current year our opportunities as partners will perhaps not be very large. But we do not live simply for a single day. For our oblasts, krais, and regions where indissoluble traditions of brotherhood, mutual aid, and helping one another out of an emergency have formed, the laying of the foundations of long-term direct ties is of special importance.

After the meeting the comrades from the Urals, Siberia, and the Altay will travel out to the republics, oblasts, rayons, and farms to establish contacts and conclude contracts. The party, soviet, and economic agencies of Uzbekistan will do everything necessary to create all the conditions for this important work.

In the broader political view we see our task in assuring, in the light of the March and April Plenums of the CPSU Central Committee, and also with a consideration of the recommendations of today's meeting, the intensification of economic and organizing work. Obviously, our meeting and the subsequent work that is carried out on various levels will be fruitful, will yield good results, and will serve the cause of reinforcing the friendship and solidarity of the Soviet nations and the cause of perestroika.

Ex-Helsinki-86 Member Founds Catholic Movement

18080056 Riga PADOMJU JAUNATNE in Latvian
15 Apr 89 p 5

[PADOMJU JAUNANTE interview with Ceslavs Massans, former member of Helsinki-86 group; unnamed correspondent, date and place]

[Text] Until the end of last year Ceslavs Massans was the leader and organizer of the Daugavpils chapter of the Helsinki-86 group. Now he has left the group and is one of the founders of the new Catholic movement "Exodus."

[Massans] The Daugavpils chapter of the Helsinki-86 group was formed in June of last year. Even then we organized the first more serious action—the memorial day for the 14 June victims. It is true. Only about 30 people and 500 policemen and representatives of the State Security Committee had gathered. Six people were working in the Daugavpils chapter. I thought that we were active enough, although Daugavpils is not the best location to organize something. Yes, with its activity Helsinki-86 practically opened all our eyes. It showed that we are truly in a pitiful condition but were not able to find an answer as to how it could be possible to get out of this situation. I consider that Helsinki-86 was a "first-push" movement that set in motion the whole restructuring of Latvia. There are no doubts that the group will still find various directions for its activity, but right now it is difficult for me to say whether this activity will provide the people with a way out of the current situation.

[PADOMJU JAUNATNE] If I may ask an improper question,—you speak Russian and obviously you have not yet learned Latvian that well—what is your nationality?

[Massans] I am a pure Latvian, going back three generations, but, as you can tell, a bad one. Although both my parents have graduated from a Latvian gymnasium and speak Latvian, as do my brother and sister, it was not taught to me. My parents were intimidated because of the fact that in their time almost all of our relatives had been deported.

[PJ] Where do you currently work?

[Massans] Currently I am not working anywhere; I have dedicated my current life to spiritual self-awareness. And in the conditions of Western Europe such a question would be considered impolite.

[PJ] What is this new Catholic organization, in whose creation you also took part?

[Massans] Its name "Exodus" derives from the Biblical story of how Moses brought his Hebrew people out from captivity in Egypt. Moreover, he was able to free his

people not only physically, but spiritually. It seems to me that we now are in a similar situation, being slaves to our self-created illusions and sins.

The aim of this movement would be to promote the spiritual awakening of Latvia and to destroy the slavery of the spirit, which to such a large degree still dwells within us. If man becomes united with God, he truly becomes liberated. And first of all he has overcome fear of death within himself. It is especially important for our movement to stress that freedom, both for a people and an individual, is first an internal state of the spirit.

[PJ] How many members are in your group right now?

[Massans] Currently there are around 25-30 people, mainly young Catholics from Riga, Daugavpils, and Rezekne...

[PJ] What would you like to promote in the life of the republic through the mediation of this group?

[Massans] First—the organization of Christian centers and libraries, the development of a Sunday school movement, and readings on church history and Christian dogma.

In addition, I wish to stress that our movement is an internal church organization; it is definitely not political.

[PJ] Has anything already been accomplished at this moment?

[Massans] I think that it is already a great accomplishment that we have organized ourselves. At the end of May, the first issue of our religious publicist magazine "Exodus" will appear. Together with students of the Daugavpils Pedagogic Institute, we have already begun public readings on spiritual themes.

[PJ] To me at least, your symbolism as a Catholic movement seems peculiar. The *auseklis* star with the red-white-red flag and the Mother of God?

[Massans] The *auseklis* has symbolized renewal to the Latvian people for almost all these centuries, but even to this day an actual rebirth of the people has not occurred. Until now in the spiritual circle we have talked about the renewal of the soul, but not yet about a new spirit.

Our movement's members have had revelations that Latvia's awakening is to be connected with a return to the Mother of God. She is the one who can give this people her blessing. She has protected this people through experiences of many centuries that another people maybe would not have survived.

[PJ] You therefore think that the Church could have a special meaning in the further development of Latvia's restructuring?

[Massans] The Church can and should be a tie between the people and God. It could, in my opinion, in some way promote the process of national unification.

[PJ] Do you have any practical plans in the near future?

[Massans] Yes, we want to renew the Virgin Mary Church in Daugavpils. In our town we wish to realize a concept similar to one which Russian Orthodox representatives have expressed in connection with the Yuriy Hospital.

[PJ] Thanks for the conversation!

[Massans] Yes, I really hope that next time I will already be able to talk to you in clear Latvian.

Metropolitan Filaret Discusses Church Social, Political Activities

18001116 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
16 Apr 89 p 3

[Interview with Filaret, Metropolitan of Kiev and Galich, Exarch of the Ukraine, by G. Chernomorskiy, correspondent and retired colonel: "The Church and Secular Matters: A Frank Dialogue"]

[Text] [Correspondent] Your Holiness, nowadays many Western radio voices, as well as our own "domestic" extremist elements within the country, by way of attempting to utilize glasnost in order to destabilize the situation in our republic, are speaking out with instigatory declarations. The gist of these declarations is that, they say, Ukrainians have no rights and that they, supposedly, do not even have their own church. The latter is, after all, named the Russian Orthodox Church.

[Filaret] Indeed, the church does bear precisely that name. But, in and by itself, this name has nothing to do with Russia or with the RSFSR. A thousand years ago, when Christianity came to us, there was no Russia, Belorussia, nor Ukraine. There was Kievan Rus. Hence also the name.

[Correspondent] But nowadays what language is employed in conducting the divine service?

[Filaret] The Ukraine has more than 4,500 parishes, and in 50 of them the service is conducted in Ukrainian, whereas in the remainder it is conducted in Church Slavonic.

[Correspondent] Does this not seem to you to be a case of discrimination against the Ukrainian language?

[Filaret] Not at all. The fact of the matter is that Christianity is professed not only by Slavs. By a decree of the Holy Synod, divine services are permitted to be conducted in the national languages. For example, in Moldavian, Estonian, Latvian, Chuvash, Yakut, Chinese, etc. As to the Ukrainian language, we have received

quite a few letters from Orthodox believers; the gist of these letters is that, inasmuch as they use their native language in their everyday lives, at work, and in their families, therefore, in communing with God they prefer to use Church Slavonic. Nor do I see any need to break this tradition which has evolved. As to individual parishes, where the believers so desire, the service may be conducted in their native language.

[Correspondent] That makes sense. But why, then, was the sermon given in Ukrainian prior to the Solemn Requiem devoted to the 175th Anniversary of Taras Grigoryevich Shevchenko's birth, a service held in the Vladimir Cathedral with representatives from this republic's other churches in attendance?

[Filaret] That was a special case. For the Ukrainian people, Shevchenko did for its language and literature what Pushkin did for Russia. It was precisely because we wished to emphasize his outstanding role that we delivered the sermon prior to the Solemn Requiem in the native language of the Great Kobzar. It would have been a sin to do otherwise.

[Correspondent] In the Old as well as the New Testaments, among the Ten Commandments there is one which states: "Thou shalt not kill." However, in recently glancing through the first issue of journal of the Moscow Patriarchate for 1989, I discovered that the Archpriest Afanasiy Mikhaylovich Romanenko "for zealous service to Christ's Church" was awarded a cross with decorations, and for his heroic deeds during the Great Patriotic War—military medals and orders. The same could be said about Archpriest Stefan Moiseyevich Rudko and Archpriest Aleksandr Matveyevich Shchedrin. The Orthodox Church Calendar notes the meritorious services of Dmitriy Donskoy as follows: "In his zealous service to Christ's Church, in his patriotic labors for his fatherland and his people during the dreadful years of the enemy yoke, he was a true son of the Russian Church, and even now providing inspiration to its faithful children as an example of self-sacrificing service to God and to human beings." This Grand Prince of Muscovy was a warrior. How can his esteem by the church be compatible with the commandment: "Thou shalt not kill"?

[Filaret] This same calendar also contains other words which explain our high esteem for this prince. They are from the Gospel: "He gave his life for others." The commandment "Thou shalt not kill" does not in any way contradict the necessity of defending one's Fatherland and one's neighbors. And how could a person love his neighbor, his own people, without being prepared to give up his own soul and life for them? It is not by chance that Aleksandr Nevskiy is among the saints.

In general, the church has done quite a bit for the Fatherland's defense. Sergey Radonezhskiy, the Father Superior of the Troitsa Monastery, blessed Dmitriy

Donskoy before the battle and, as a symbol of unconditional support, sent two monks to help Dmitriy. Their names were Oslab and Peresvet, and they gave their lives for the Fatherland and for their neighbors.

[Correspondent] By the way, in the old Russian navy there were warships which bore their names.

[Filaret] I think that this would be not a bad thing to do even nowadays.... In any case, it would be much better than having just an impersonal number on the side of the ship. After all, the names of heroes are also a tradition, and they remind people of the need to serve their Motherland.

[Correspondent] Aleksandr Nevskiy, Dmitriy Donsky, and Dmitriy Pozharskiy were warriors....

[Filaret] Enrolled among the saints are quite a few persons of spiritual vocation [sic]. There is Sergey Radonezhskiy, about whom I have already spoken. There is also the Most Holy Patriarch Yermogen. During the 17th century he inspired the people to liberate the Motherland from foreign predators. The occupation forces cast him into the cellar of the Chudovo Monastery, which was located inside the Moscow Kremlin. For more than 9 months he languished in captivity, and on 17 February 1612 he perished in torment from starvation....

[Correspondent] In September 1943 your father, the infantry private Anton Dmitriyevich Denisenko, perished during the fighting to liberate Zaporozhye. He was a believer....

[Filaret] But there were also non-believers together with him. The church likewise blessed them and all people engaged in the holy war against fascism. And not only blessed them. The priest Yefimiy Spodarenko rendered effective aid to the partisans in Cherkassy Oblast. The Hitlerites quartered him. Ye. Spodarenko's fate was shared by many clergymen.

You, of course, know that money collected from believers was used to outfit a tank column entitled "Dmitriy Donsky," and airplanes for the squadron bearing the name of Aleksandr Nevskiy. In short, we recognize the justifiability of defensive wars to liberate the Fatherland and its people. That is why we are for the necessity of army service and preparedness for the Fatherland's defense....

[Correspondent] Your Lordship's point of view coincides, to a large extent, with the Marxist-Leninist doctrine on war and peace.

[Filaret] I consider it necessary, however, to state that, regardless of goals or motives, any nuclear war is deemed amoral by the church. On 10 February 1985 the Holy Synod directed an appeal to the entire Christian world not to allow nuclear war. We advocate the complete elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000. And,

in general, it is high time that we put an end to all wars. I am confident that such a viewpoint has been met with understanding by all healthy-minded persons.

[Correspondent] The peace-loving efforts of the Russian Orthodox Church have merited universal recognition. But, as I understand it, the church does not concern itself with just this. Mercy, charity.... There are certainly quite a few points where such an influential organization as the church could apply its efforts. Recently Mother Teresa came to the Soviet Union with a group of nuns. They cared for the wounded who had suffered from the earthquake in Armenia. Such an act of humanitarianism can only be welcomed. But why only Mother Teresa, and not Mother Fedora or, let's say, Mother Pelageya? Are Orthodox nuns really any less merciful?

[Filaret] Hardly. Let me remind you that the very concept of a sister of mercy, or, as people sometimes say, a merciful sister, first arose during the period of the Crimean War of 1854-1855. And the Pokrovskiy Convent was instituted with precisely this purpose in mind. The nuns prayed to God and rendered aid to the wounded soldiers who were undergoing treatment at the Kiev Hospital, which is preparing to mark its 250th anniversary soon. And at the present time the Ministry of Health is ready to accept our help. Unfortunately, there is still no appropriate legislation regarding cooperation between the church and the health-care organs. If there is such legislation in the future, then the convents would conduct the necessary medical training so that our sister-nuns could more skillfully care for those persons who are ill and suffering.

[Correspondent] And how do matters stand with regard to charity work?

[Filaret] The church is an active participant in the Fund for Mercy, the Soviet Children's Fund imeni Lenin, and the Fund for Peace. The Russian Orthodox Church has transferred more than 5 million rubles to the fund for aiding those persons who suffered from the earthquake in Armenia, as well as 1 million rubles to eliminate the consequences of the natural disaster in Georgia. In due course it has also contributed several million rubles to the Chernobyl Fund. We have rendered and will continue to render moral and material support to the internationalist-soldiers. But it is not only a matter of money or how much money. We consider it one of our principal tasks to imbue all believers with a sense of mercy. And not only them.

[Correspondent] The church has always struggled for a strong, centralized state. Has its viewpoint on this matter not changed nowadays?

[Filaret] The entire history of our state bears witness to the fact that many troubles could have been avoided if there had not been internecine strife among the princes. They weakened our state considerably. That is why Bati was successful in subduing Rus and enslaving it for

centuries. And can a sectional fractionation really facilitate economic development? Even now we are in favor of a firm union of all the peoples which inhabit our Motherland. A Union based on equal rights, mutual love, and respect. Any and all types of compartmentalization will facilitate its weakening and destroy the established economic ties.

[Correspondent] The church has been separated from the state. But, after all, believers constitute a component of Soviet society. And inasmuch as perestroika has been proceeding apace in this country, it, obviously, must have affected the church as well.

[Filaret] It certainly has. Guarantees of freedom of belief and religious profession have become more realistic. A law on freedom of conscience is now being worked out, and we hope that it will be in the spirit of democratic perestroika. In response to requests from believers, the following facilities have been turned over to the church for care and administration: The Svyato-Danilov Monastery in Moscow, the Optina pustyn Historical Landmark in Kaluga Oblast, the Tolgskiy Monastery in Yaroslavl Oblast, and a considerable part of the Kiev-Pecherskaya lavra. These are actual fruits of new approaches to state-church relations, which are determined, above all, by the interests of unity for the entire nation. There is a gradual erasing of that invisible boundary line which, for decades, separated believers from non-believers and which had come, in large measure, to divide society.

And are not the preliminary results of the elections for people's deputies really a genuine testimony to the new approaches? For the first time in 70 years pro forma voting was replaced by elections with alternatives. And their results attest to the increased political self-awareness of the individual person, as well as our society as a whole. I cannot help being gratified by the fact that among the elected representatives of the people there are quite a few church leaders, including Pimen, Patriarch of Moscow and of All Russia. And how could it be otherwise? Public business must be done by all of us together.

[Correspondent] In speaking at a meeting with Pimen, the Patriarch of Moscow and of All Russia, along with members of the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church, M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, noted that "...religious organizations were also affected by the tragic consequences of the cult of personality." You, Your Lordship, were a participant at that meeting. In my opinion, our readers would be interested in hearing Your commentary on how 30 years of Stalinism were reflected in the church's activities.

[Filaret] Not only cathedrals—extremely valuable historical landmarks—were destroyed. Culture, faith, and justice were also devastated. It is possible that this is put too

categorically, but the very individual personality was devastated. And everybody knows what this led to. And how many clergymen were repressed....

[Correspondent] But, of course, these distortions are now being eliminated....

[Filaret] Of course. In places where it is possible, cathedrals are being returned to the believers. And the names of clergymen are being restored to history. For example, Metropolitan Serafim has been rehabilitated. Rehabilitated even earlier was Luka, Metropolitan of Simferopol and the Crimea; he was well-known to many laymen as a medical doctor and a brilliant surgeon. Boyko-Yasnetskiy and many other clergymen have also been rehabilitated. However, many others were also slandered and have not yet had their good names restored.

[Correspondent] In addition to performing your duties as Patriarchal Exarch of the Ukraine, You are still chairman of the Committee for Continuing Christian Peace Conference—an international, peace-promoting organization with its permanent headquarters in Prague. I understand that matters connected with religious activity must come first with You. But, of course, You must have many interests in common with laymen. Do You read periodicals? What is your attitude toward literature, painting, and motion pictures? Are clergymen forbidden to view motion-picture and television films? Or are there some sorts of restrictions here?

[Filaret] It is really a matter of priorities. I usually sleep 6 hours during a 24-hour period. Nor is Sunday a "day off" for me. There is a service to be conducted. I have to budget my time very precisely. But how can one help but read newspapers and journals these days? They have become more pointed, more interesting, and the main thing is that they raise problems which affect the entire society. I have a respectful attitude toward works on military topics. They disclose on a greater canvas the struggle between good and evil. I read with pleasure O. Gonchar's "The Standard-Bearers," K. Simonov's trilogy, "The Living and the Dead," and M. Sholokhov's "One Man's Fate." I also liked Ch. Aytmatov's "The Executioner's Block" and the books by S. Zalygin and V. Rasputin. They disclose the people's soul, evoke a sense of surviving together; they teach us to live by our conscience, and they challenge human beings to become better. As regards painting, I am an admirer of A. Rublev; I also like the paintings of Vereshchagin and Repin, Vasnetsov and Nesterov.

I was greatly impressed by Glazunov's canvas entitled "The 20th Century." It contains the history of our Motherland, its joys and sorrows.

[Correspondent] And whom do you prefer among the foreign artists?

[Filaret] Rembrandt.

[Correspondent] Did you like the Biblical subject of his painting entitled "The Return of the Prodigal Son"? Are you an admirer of the Flemish School?

[Filaret] I also like other pictures by Rembrandt. One sees the character of human beings in them. As to the Flemish School, I have different attitudes to the creative work of its representatives. For example, many people like Rubens. But take his canvases. The human body is excellently depicted in his painting, but it is more difficult to catch the spiritual quality of his heroes. But, I repeat, that is my own subjective opinion.

Now about motion pictures and television. I am against pornography; I am also opposed to hopeless situations. Art must inculcate hope, faith, and love. Clergymen are not forbidden to see films. On this level, the church is completely up to date. But I will allow myself to cite something which the Apostle Paul wrote in one of his letters to the Corinthians: "Everything is allowed to me, but not everything is wholesome. Everything is allowed to me, but not everything is edifying." In other words, we must be careful in using the freedom at our disposal. Freedom is a great blessing, and it must be used so as not to bring pain to our neighbor or, of course, to ourselves. Naturally, this pertains not only to motion pictures but to all aspects of our lives.

Komsomol Actors Raise Funds to Restore Church
18120100a Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
4-11 Jun 89 p 14

[Article by Mark Zakharov, CPSU member, people's deputy of the USSR, artistic and administrative director of the Lenin Komsomol Theatre]

[Text] Not far from Moscow's Lenin Komsomol Theatre, at the beginning of the former Malaya Dmitrovka, there is an architectural masterpiece of the 17th century—the Church of the Birth of Our Lady in Putinki. It was the last structure of this type and built on the orders of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich after the big Moscow fire of 1652. The place marks the start of the road to the city of Dmitrov. It is now a stable. True, the horses are absent, but the church has been used for many years as a menagerie for the state circus. Now it serves as a storage place for circus equipment and a training base.

The actors from the Lenin Komsomol Theatre intend to produce their most daring and expensive play—to return to the church its majesty, to ask pardon for the sins of our fathers and grandfathers, to repent publicly and cleanse away this outrageous misuse of a Russian Orthodox sacred building.

The owners of the Church in Putinki—the managers from the state circus, our wonderful public personality Yuri Nikulin, and other leaders of the circus have praised the efforts of Alexander Abdulov, an actor who

heads the actor-administrative group of the theatre. Together with other circus performers, he wants to restore the In Putinki Church.

We're people in the know. We realize how complex the task is economically and what's most important—the legal problems involved. We realize that it will not be simple to find the necessary finances, materials, documents and labour to restore even such a small church—the last relic of the famous Strastnaya Square, destroyed by Stalin's thugs.

On July 6 this year we dream of raising the first sums of money and receiving a metropolitan's blessing. If the cautious metropolitans are afraid then we'll find a priest who's not afraid to come to the temporary stage near our "Theatre in the Yard" to perform the blessing ceremony. On that day we'll assemble various actors, and our own theatre choir under the leadership of Vasily Shkil, Genady Trofimov and Vladimir Prokhorov will perform the artistic prologue.

We want to thank, in advance, everyone who'll be able to pay the ten-roubles ticket price which will be used to restore the church. The actors will perform free that day on our "Theatre in the Yard." We also think those Soviet and foreign sponsors who've already expressed a willingness to help us—Project Ifra from West Germany, the Rodnik plant in Kuibyshev and the Novator cooperative in Moscow.

If we're not stifled before July 6 by the great forces of condescending functionaries who would prefer a picture gallery or a concert hall to a restored church, then we'll start. We'll do it, I know!

It's a shame that I lack a religious education and the moral right to end this article with a fragment from a ceremonial prayer. Instead, I just wish to say to all who on July 6 will come to help restore people's lost cultural values—"God bless you!"

Writer Supports Return to Morals, Religious Faith

18120100b Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 22, 4-11 Jun 89 p 11

[Article by I. Grekova: "Faith and Education"]

[Text] My main occupation has always been teaching—on the university level and occasionally, at secondary schools. For over 60 years I was in daily contact with children and young people. Many of my pupils have become lifetime friends. But I'm not going to write about them now. I'm going to write about those whom the elder generations often call "immortal." Indeed, "old-fashioned principles" like "morals," "charity," "conscience" and "decency" do exist, and we are now returning to them after long years of silence. The people deprived

(often forcefully) of such principles make up a certain caste within the society, often disconnected from the rest even in terms of the language they speak. Conversations with their elder frequently dead-end in mutual incomprehension.

Older people often look down on young ones and scorn them as if to say that we were better when we were your age. No, it wasn't we who were better, it was the surrounding reality. Of course, reminiscing about those times I can't help feeling the exultation of being young. Perhaps the people who were young in the most frightening of times also recollect their youth with sentimental affection. I am one of those people who witnessed the most drastic turns in our social consciousness. I'm one of those now few and far between before whose eyes those "old-fashioned" principles had once ruled supreme, then were cast away, dethroned and repudiated—only to be revived decades later.

I was born in 1907—my parents were both teachers—and was ten at the time of the Revolution. I witnessed all the changes: from the comparatively well-to-do, if modest, prerevolutionary life, to the Revolution, to war communism and NEP (the New Economic Policy) to the "personality cult," to the stagnation years and to the present incipient democratism.

All sorts of other "waves" and "changes" in our social life also passed before my eyes. I saw the "old-fashioned" principles destroyed, discredited and banished from our life. Moreover, I helped destroy them, while remaining a decent person inside.

My green years coincided with NEP. Having left school in 1923, I was "directed" to study at a higher educational institution and entered the math department of Leningrad University. I was influenced by my father, a mathematician, and at the time, rather sorry about it since I was drawn to literature. But later I blessed my choice virtually every day. I could refrain from lying though our whole life demanded that we lie continuously. But perhaps I'm wrong there: had Stalin lived longer, he might have got down to mathematicians too. The idea accepted in any civilized society that to criticize anything one has to be at least to some degree competent in the field has been refuted by our long experience. It's enough to recall Stalin's *Marxism and the Problems of Linguistics* to see that.

Anyway, I lived my professional life virtually unharmed, never experiencing what it was like to be criticized (not counting the light punches during the "campaign against cybernetics").

It's hard to describe the student life of the 1920s. There were too many of us. In a crowd of 280 we'd rush down the University corridors in search of an auditorium large enough to accommodate us all. Some auditoriums were not popular because they were already occupied by rats. These beasts, driven from the University basement

by the grandiose flood of 1924, became increasingly insolent and often attended our lectures. Well, we soon got used to the rats. But the size of the classes was a real problem. Apart from regular students, lectures were often attended by outsiders. Having failed to find a large enough auditorium, we often packed a smaller one and sat on the floor.

We students dressed more than modestly. I had a single dress for all seasons, sewn and embroidered by my mother. I wonder whether I could today find a girl who had only one dress. But we never worried about trifles like that. We were strong, young, and above all proud. Pride stands out in my memory as the most characteristic feature of those years.

We had thrown to the winds everything that connected us with the past: customs, marriage, christenings, even funeral rites—these were all relics fit only to be despised and banished. We considered it profoundly indecent to keep an eye on anybody's morals. That did not mean that we were immoral. It only meant morals were not to be talked about in public.

What was our attitude to the surrounding reality? It was wonderful. Our country, with its poverty, youthfulness and novelty, seemed just wonderful to us.

And now about myself—and faith.

I came from a traditionally religious family of teachers. Before the Revolution we celebrated Easter, Christmas, and Trinity.... I will never forget the smell of withering leaves on the birches put in every room on Trinity Day. Then came the Revolution, and the period of war communism with its hunger, cold and deprivations. From here that period looks very long, although it lasted only three or four years. After that—the transition to NEP, and most importantly, the University: the beginning of a really free and radiant life. NEP was a really great epoch.

Growing up in this deeply religious family, I began resisting that pious spirit quite early. I can well remember the moment when, at the peak of war communism, I first felt my individual identity as separate from all others. We were about to sit down to a meal, and I was awfully hungry. Little pieces of oilcake were waiting for us on plates (or rather saucers), but something prevented us from sitting down. At last, everyone was there and my father said Grace standing at the head of the table: "All our eyes are tuned to You, Lord, and You are giving us our food in good time, and You open Your generous hand to fill every animal with good grace." As my father recited the prayer, I looked around at the shabby table covered with a torn, filthy oilcloth, and the word "animal" applied to all of us seemed so funny to me. I felt like laughing, puffed up my cheeks and stayed that way till the prayer was over. Those puffed cheeks were, perhaps, the end of my childish piety.

I loved my father then as I loved him all my life. To this day, there has never been anyone dearer to me. He combined his piety with humour, and could there be a more delightful combination?

I came to the University as a confirmed atheist. "When I die, burdock will grow out of me," said Turgenev's nihilistic character Bazarov, but oh, was that burdock far away at that time!

Our personal well-being was of no concern to us then. Watching the successes of our state, everyone was supposed to imitate us. We were what I would call "devout atheists," never stooping to envy. None of us ever desecrated our souls by envying a NEPman's wife with her silk stockings and high heels. We didn't give a damn who lived better or worse. Life was exciting—and that was happiness.

Many decades have passed since, and now that I'm nearing the end I will neither condemn nor justify our youthful nihilism, inevitable at history's sharp turns, especially in very young people. But my attitude towards religion has changed, and changed radically. I now often recall the words of the great philosopher Immanuel Kant: "Two things fill my heart with ever new and increasingly powerful wonder and veneration, the more and the longer I ponder them. These are the star-studded sky above my head and the moral imperative inside my soul." How far more noble-minded and refined such veneration is than our nihilism of the 1920s.

The mysteries that troubled Kant have remained mysteries to this day. Despite all the scientific efforts and the abundance of hypotheses on the origins of the Universe, they still remain no more than hypotheses and will most likely never be really and truly proved. Equally mysterious are the causes of moral categories in human beings. These categories may vary from one nation to another, from one century to another, but their general tendency away from "evil" and towards "good" remains unchanged. This is characteristic of Christianity, of Islam, and of Buddhism—in fact of every religion with a sufficiently long history.

There is yet another mystery: it is the mystery of individual identity, the separation of oneself from one's surroundings. Where does this "ego" come from and how does it happen to be juxtaposed to everything else? I believe that other people, like myself, are aware of their identity. But this is just **faith**, pure and simple.

Bringing up children is something that concerns us all. When a child is but two years old we teach him or her to say "I am." Later we teach them to put on other people's shoes, and view the world through other people's eyes. This is the most important aspect of education. Children miss out on it at kindergartens or in children's homes—in fact in all places where human beings are brought together according to some common characteristic. In

certain individuals such a habit of "thinking for the other" develops spontaneously, of its own accord. And this is nothing short of a miracle.

For 70 years, our country has been fighting religion. It began with bringing pigs into churches in the early years of the Komsomol and continues to this day with boring lectures on "cosmic topics" to which people can only be lured by a promise of dancing afterwards.

Yet faith never died out among the people. Men who are more status-oriented avoided going to church. But women who are less responsible and also more courageous, did go. They were wedded there, they christened their children and mourned their dead in church, even when it was prohibited.

For me personally, believing is a form of recognition of the things in our life that I cannot understand. Since such things do exist, I am for believing. Not in just one particular form, but in many forms, I was brought up an Orthodox Christian, and I find this faith more congenial than others. But I readily recognize the right of other forms of faith to exist, too.

Every form of faith establishes certain moral norms. Violation of these norms is considered a sin.

The norms, rules or "commandments" change as humanity evolves. But have the commandments like "You shall not commit murder," "You shall not steal," "Honour your father and your mother..." lost their meaning today? I don't think so.

For decades, our people were told that there was nothing absolute in the world, that the only justification of an action was whether it was useful or harmful to the construction of socialism in the form then considered to be correct. Can morals rest on such flimsy assumptions? Obviously not. Given such an assumption, every change in the leadership must lead to changes in moral norms. For years our children were told that Pavlik Morozov—who betrayed his own father to the authorities—was a model of virtue. How could one so shamefully distort the essence of one of the eternal commandments?

The violation of any commandment was always regarded as a sin. I am all for teaching a child as early as possible—while he is still sucking at his mother's breast—that SIN is a violation of human norms of behaviour. The notion of sin is simple enough to be grasped by an immature mind.

I don't mean that commandments may never be violated by anyone. There are situations when violating them is legitimate and well justified (for instance, in the course of a patriotic war). But even in such a case "sin" is an action to be contemplated seriously, debated with one's conscience and reason.

The most frightening thing is **habitual sin**. Unfortunately, our epoch has produced many people who have developed a habit of sinning. And when today, like all others, they glorify perestroika, that is but another variety of "habitual sin."

Between the killer and the killed in our society there often exist a series of buttons, controls and other automatic and semiautomatic devices enabling the killer to say, "I didn't kill, I only pressed the button." Nevertheless Claude Eatherly, the pilot who dropped the first atom bomb on Japan, went mad and died in an insane asylum. When somebody mentioned that episode in the presence of my old acquaintance, the wise Aunt Polly, from whom we have rented a dacha for years, she remarked philosophically, "A Bolshevik would not have gone mad."

Indeed, our people had reason enough to go mad—not just because of other people's sins, but because of our own. It will take years, perhaps decades, to rid ourselves of our habit of sinning. But if we don't, we shall never find our way out of our moral morass.

Once, in the first postrevolutionary years, we aspired to a world revolution. The motto does not work today. All over the world many different forms of society have emerged, run according to different principles. We and our model of socialism have found ourselves lagging behind rather than leading the way. Having the world's largest resources of timber, minerals and other natural wealth, we have dragged this country down with appalling mismanagement to its current wretched condition. Witness the high infant mortality rate and the generally unhealthy state of the nation, the incessant drinking of moonshine and vodka, and the people's destitution. But worse of all are the lies, lies, lies. The habit of lying cannot be overcome in a trice, as soon as people are told, "The truth, nothing but the truth."

What shall we struggle for now? For preserving the good things we have managed to acquire and for living decently, despite all the obstacles, as befits humans—with our own peculiarities and according to our own principles.

The time has come to revive the old-fashioned notions of "conscience," "humanity," "decency," and also "sin." Some people might think that having imbibed the latter notion in childhood, one is bound to grow up a believer. This is not necessarily the case. One grows out of notions as one grows out of clothes. One is free to choose any way insofar as faith is concerned. One can assimilate the religion one found congenial as a child, one can grow up an atheist, or develop a position most naturally connected with early upbringing. All I care about is that one not develop the shameful and humiliating habit of sinning. Let one remain a **decent human being**—this is the best legacy we can pass on to our children.

Rovno Authorities Block Believers' Attempts To Have Church Returned

18001162 Moscow NEDELYA in Russian
No 20, 15-21 May 89 p 9

[Article by Sergey Vlasov, journalist: "A Cathedral in Captivity"]

[Text] Standing in the center of the city of Rovno is its most beautiful structure—the Svyato-Voskresenskiy Cathedral, a landmark of 19th-century architecture. Up to 1962 this cathedral was operational, but on a certain night it was shut up and sealed tight; its icons and golden church utensils were hauled off to some unknown place. The crosses on the domes were sawed away, and the bells were removed. For 10 years the cathedral stood boarded up and nailed tight. Then some "bright-minded" person got the idea of creating a museum of atheism in it.

All during these years, for more than a quarter of a century now, the former parishioners of the Syato-Voskresenskiy Cathedral have been requesting that the cathedral be returned to them and that their congregation be registered anew. Because they had been taken off the registration rolls after the cathedral was closed down, and they were then merged with the congregation of the Uspenskiy Church. The believers knocked on all the doors, and they appealed to all the administrative levels more than once—but all to no avail. All their complaints addressed to Kiev and to Moscow were punctually sent back to Rovno, and the local authorities replied time and time again that they deemed the return of the cathedral to the believers unfeasible: it has now become crowded around the cathedral, and, therefore, there is no possibility for fencing it in, as is the accepted thing to do; there is no possibility for constructing toilets alongside the cathedral or to equip a parking lot for motor vehicles.... Slipping in among the many official replies is the following puzzled question: Why do the believers need this, when, after all, the city has five operational churches?

But these indefatigable old men and women have, in recent years, begun to write even more actively. In their letters they sensibly remind people that this cathedral was built on the donations of believers, that it is a holy place for Orthodox Christians, and that nowadays, when relations between Church and State have taken such a favorable turn, it is not good to have such a negative attitude toward a request for the return of a cathedral.

To my way of thinking, this conflict could have been resolved long ago if the persons in authority had not assumed that a step to meet the believers would be an ideological defeat, a concession and a yielding to the dark past.

Today we have come to our senses, and we openly acknowledge that believers are also Soviet persons, and they have the complete right to express all their opinions, including the religious ones, in a worthy, dignified manner. Yes, we acknowledge this in our words, but when it

comes to deeds, then the inertia of the old way of thinking makes itself felt, and we seek out reasons why the concessions should not be made.

And reasons can always be found. They were likewise found in our case. Figuring as the principal argument in all the replies at the various levels is the fact that the city has five churches. And, therefore, the "believers in the city of Rovno have the full possibility of satisfying their religious needs." I cite this from a letter to Moscow from Comrade P.D. Pilipenko, the first deputy chairman of the Council on Religious Affairs under the UkSSR Council of Ministers. But it would be interesting to ask those who signed the replies whether they have been inside these churches during a Sunday or a holiday service.

I attempted to drop into one of the Sunday services at the Uspenskiy Church on Shevchenko Street, but I was unsuccessful: during the course of the entire service more than half of the parishioners stood on the street in front of the church, because they could not get inside; the church was simply packed chock-full. People could not even turn around. This jam reminded me of the crowded conditions in the larger stations of the Moscow Metro during rush hours. There could be no thought of getting out of the church until the service ended. Such an unbearable crowding has already been the cause of five deaths. People often become ill from the stuffy atmosphere, from the heat, but they cannot get out of their human captivity.

Why and for whom is this blatant lie necessary?...

Indeed, there are five churches located within the Rovno city limits. But the usable space amounts to only 570 square meters. If we divide the number of believers into them, we receive a figure of 120 persons per square meter. And what kind of sanitary norms would have to be applied in order to talk about the "complete possibilities for satisfying their religious needs?"

Now the arguments against returning this cathedral to the believers have been added to. A recent extraordinary session of the city Soviet of People's Deputies by a majority of votes rendered the following decision: The cathedral will not be returned to the believers, but a new cathedral will be built on the outskirts of the city. It is easy to say—will be built, but where will the funds come from if the needs for kindergartens and schools are only being met to the extent of 75 percent in this city? To this very day in many schools the kids are attending school in three shifts. And so how much time will pass by before the dome of a new cathedral will reach to the sky? And during all these years the believers will be packed into the churches or, as many of them have already been doing for a long time, they will ride out for dozens of kilometers to pray at a monastery.

They say that after a fist-fight, it is hard to wave. Nevertheless, let's recall how democratically the extraordinary session of the City Soviet was prepared and conducted. I have formed the opinion that democracy in this case was skillfully "managed." Three days before the session the local press carried an article devoted to the disputes raging around the cathedral. But this article was composed in such a clever way that none of the believers was given the right to speak. The people who did talk—and they talked a great deal—were just the opponents of returning the cathedral: the city's chief architect, the chief of the GAI [State Motor Vehicle Inspectorate], the chief of the fire department, the chief sanitary physician, the chief of the museum of atheism, and the chairman of the gorispolkom. Not a single argument in favor of the believers' viewpoint is cited in the article.

That is the way public opinion was prepared. And this is called glasnost and democracy?

At the session itself pluralism of opinions was also observed in an extremely one-sided manner: the representatives of the authorities were given unlimited opportunities to state their opinions. Both the chairman of the gorispolkom and the chief city architect read out whole lectures to the deputies, whereas the speeches of the believers were regulated so strictly that one of them was not even allowed to read out a letter from Academician D.S. Likhachev, chairman of the Board of the Soviet Fund for Culture, to the chairman of the Rovno Oblispolkom with regard to the cathedral.

Well now, let's just do that ourselves. Here is an excerpt from Dmitriy Sergeyevich's letter:

"It was refused to return the cathedral to the believers on the grounds that the cathedral is situated in the center of the city.... This, however, cannot be a serious obstacle.... Many of Moscow's and Leningrad's functioning churches are located in the center.... The preponderant right to religious buildings must be that of the believers if they claim them. Allow me to cite the words of M.S. Gorbachev, spoken by him at a meeting with Patriarch Pimen and the members of the Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church: 'The believers are Soviet persons, working people, patriots, and they have the complete right to express their own convictions in a worthy, dignified manner.'"

It would be appropriate here to recall that in large cities many operational cathedrals are situated in the most crowded places, in direct proximity to thoroughfares, for example, the Yelokhovskaya Church, the Patriarchal Cathedral, or the Church of All Saints in Moscow, the Vladimir Cathedral in Kiev.... If one were to apply to them the argumentation of many of the speakers at the City Soviet session, these churches would have to be closed down immediately!

The decision of the session has been made, but the issue has remained unresolved. After the session was over, a noisy meeting of the believers continued for several

hours at the doors of the House of Culture, where the session had taken place. This meeting continued late into the evening at the building of the party obkom.

"Why humiliate people? Haven't we suffered enough even without this?" Such were the opinions heard from the crowd of old men and women.

"We will fight for our cathedral to the end," I was told by Zoya Maksimovna Gordeychuk, a woman on a pension, an invalid of the second group, who had been a bulldozer-operator in the past. She lives all by herself; her faith is the only thing she has left in her life.

"What good does it do anyone to embitter the people?" asked Zoya Maksimovna. "A museum of atheism is the cathedral—what could be more blasphemous? No, we just won't calm down, and we won't let them fool us. We've suffered enough outrages and violations of our faith and consciences...."

Two days after the City Soviet session, when I was just about to leave Rovno, a delegation of believers again assembled with the intention of going to the gorispolkom.

"No, we haven't calmed down, and we'll fight for our cathedral," I was told by Grigoriy Konstantinovich Kovalev, a former partisan, an underground fighter, a Cavalier of the Order of Glory. "And until they return the cathedral to us, we won't believe in the reality of perestroyka."

As we see, the situation in Rovno remains tense, and the City Council session only exacerbated it. And at this point the following question is appropriate: Was it right, in general, to bring up for discussion at this session such a delicate, such a specific problem. A cathedral is not just an ordinary building, and the approach taken here must not be just an ordinary one, but rather a political, historical approach—taking into account a knowledge of

the entire situation in the country, something that arose not just today but from that period when people began to smash churches in the most obscene way, to persecute believers and priests, thereby violating the law. The time has come to manifest the maximum benevolence with regard to believers.

In our case, we have no doubt that this is possible.

The Voskresenskiy Cathedral in the center of the city of Rovno has proved not to be in the captivity of the buildings surrounding it, but the captive of outmoded views on the church in general. A cathedral is a religious building, and all its features, including the architectural ones, are designed and intended for the believers. This is completely obvious, and if we nowadays are using cathedrals for something different, then this is a manifestation of our barbarism, for which we will be ashamed at some time in the future.

"It would be justifiable, in general, to hand over all the Orthodox cathedrals to the Russian Orthodox Church, which would bear complete responsibility for them," says K.M. Kharchev, chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs under the USSR Council of Ministers. "Only in case there are no objections on the part of the believers, could the religious buildings be handed over for other needs. But, you know, this is really wicked and absurd: there is a church in the city, and the local leadership would compel the believers to build a new cathedral. Why? The Council on Religious Affairs will strive to overturn such decisions as that."

Such are the demands of the new thinking, the demands of the times.

To return cathedrals to believers means to rescue people from the undeserved insult and injury which were inflicted upon them in former times. To return cathedrals to believers means to prove to ourselves that the age-old traditions of our Fatherland are dear to us. To return cathedrals to believers means to assert that freedom of conscience in our country is not an empty sound.

Draft Charter of USSR Writers' Union Published
18000678 Moscow *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* in
Russian No 12, 22 Mar 89 p 3

[Text of draft of USSR Writers' Union Charter]

[Text] The USSR Writers' Union is a voluntary self-governing social creative organization of professional literary figures which operates on the basis of the USSR Constitution and the current Charter and in its activities relies on the principles of socialist democracy, glasnost, personal initiative, and the accountability of each member of the Union.

Section 1. The Goals of the USSR Writers' Union and Its Jurisdiction

1. The basic goal of the Union is to develop multinational Soviet literature and increase its ideological-esthetic potential. The Union supports the basic principles of Soviet literature—the principles of party-mindedness and people's character [narodnost] of artistic creativity in their truly Leninist understanding, recognizes the program goals of the CPSU and is guided by them in its work, and actively participates in the country's sociopolitical life in order to carry out the tasks of revolutionary perestroika.

The Union considers freedom of creativity an indispensable condition of the development of literature.

In its work the Writers' Union is oriented to pluralism of opinions, breadth of creative discussion, and diversity of esthetic strivings and literary directions by consistently supporting works which are realistic in method and socialist in idea.

An artistic grasp of the truth of reality in the fullness of the dialectical contradictions of its development and renewal and in its aspiration towards socialist, genuinely humanist ideas common to mankind is the creative starting principle of Soviet literature of the age of perestroika and democratization of our life.

The Union supports truthful, talented, and artistically and ideologically significant works of literature of all styles and genres, encourages and supports originality and brilliance of artistic language, and promotes strengthening of the spirit of free creative pursuit, principledness, and social activism in literature. The Union is trying to help affirm both in life and in creativity everything that is new, honest, and progressive and is fighting against that which is routine, nonprogressive, and stagnant.

The Union considers it fundamentally important to create in the writers' medium an atmosphere of openness and truthfulness, genuinely comradely competition of talented persons, and the formulation of a collective writers' opinion on the most important issues of artistic creativity.

2. The jurisdiction of the Union includes the following:

- coordination of the work of the republic writers' unions and the organizations equivalent to them;
 - analysis of the condition and trends of development of multinational Soviet and world literature and on its basis formulation of the strategic directions of development of literary and publishing activity, and strengthening of its material-technical base;
 - development and strengthening of democratic principles in book-publishing activity, development and experimental testing of new forms and methods of social-state leadership of publishing activity and the book trade;
 - indoctrination of the next literary generation, communication to young literary figures of the creative experience of the older generation, and development and experimental testing of new models of professional training of literary figures;
 - the right of legislative initiative within the limits of its jurisdiction;
 - presentation and defense of the interests of the republic writers' unions and the organizations equivalent to them on questions which are part of the jurisdiction of the Union organs of state power and management;
 - defense of the creative, professional, and civil rights of literary figures and their creative legacy and participation in developing new legal norms in this sphere;
 - formulation of the basic principles of cooperation and implementation of international contacts in the sphere of literature and publishing activities;
 - execution of management activity and disposal of its own capital.
3. When state organs adopt management decisions which are unsubstantiated or not within their jurisdiction and which may damage the development of literary and publishing work or the creative destiny of a writer or limit his rights, the USSR Writers' Union has the right to consider preventing their implementation.

Section 2. Main Directions of the Activity of the USSR Writers' Union

1. In the Field of Development of Soviet Literature:

1. Sets up the following in its structure:

- professional creative associations and associations for all types of genres of literary creativity;
- associations of writers linked by common creative interests;

—councils and commissions on international literary ties (with sections on particular national literatures of Soviet people), on publishing activity and the book trade, on the education and improvement of the creative skills of literary figures, on international ties, on military sponsorship work, and the like.

2. In every possible way facilitates the professional, civic, and moral formative stage and creates comradeship among young literary figures and in amateur literary clubs and other social organizations.

3. Together with the organs of state power and management formulates the basic principles of the operation and development of publishing work and the book trade and participates in selecting, placing, and certifying leadership cadres, formulating and ratifying publishing plans, and distributing state resources focused on developing publishing activity.

4. Develops and affirms democratic principles in the activities of literary-artistic journals, newspapers, and book publishing houses of the Writers' Union system (competitive replacement in leadership posts, election of editorial collegia in editorial councils, and the like).

5. Organizes and conducts the following:

—all-Union, republic, and regional literary conferences, festivals, competitions, days of literatures, meetings, and discussions;

—creative laboratories and seminars on rendering professional help to literary figures.

6. Authorizes creative work trips for writers to study and gather material.

7. Ratifies creativity stipends granted by republic writers' unions and organizations equivalent to them.

8. Establishes and awards prizes of the USSR Writers' Union for the creation of significant literary works of all genres.

9. Nominates writers to compete for the USSR Lenin and State Prizes and submits their names for governmental awards, honorary titles, and receipt of personal pensions.

10. Sets up a legal commission to decide disputed legal and creative questions which arise on the grounds of professional activity.

Legal commissions are also created under republic writers' unions and organizations equivalent to them by decisions of their governing boards.

II. In the Field of the Study and Formation of Public Opinion and the Scientific Interpretation of the Literary Process

1. Promotes the development of all types of literary criticism by ensuring its high professionalism and making certain that in the sphere of criticism the defense of talent is combined with high esthetic standards and a principled party orientation.

2. Recruits scientific centers, museums, and other organizations involved in literature to perform the practical tasks of developing literary creativity and carrying out esthetic indoctrination of the people.

3. Publishes materials which explain and summarize the literary process: the results of research in the field of history and the theory of literature, literary studies, literary criticism, and sociology.

4. Sets up houses of literary figures, clubs, and other institutions in keeping with the Union's charter goals.

5. Supervises the activity of the All-Union Center for Propaganda of Artistic Literature.

III. In the Field of Publishing Activity and the Book Trade

1. Sets up artistic literature newspapers and journals and supervises their work.

2. Sets up book publishing houses and supervises their work.

3. Stimulates the search for new forms of publishing activity.

4. Sets up writers' counters and bookstores, holds book auctions and fairs, and helps the system of book exchange and the commission, used, and old book trade.

IV. In the Field of Coordinating the Activity of the Republic Writers' Unions

1. In all possible ways helps develop and mutually enrich the national literatures of the peoples of the USSR by helping improve the quality of literary translations and helping broadly disseminate the best works of the writers of all republics.

2. Ensures independence in the activities of the republic writers' unions.

3. Organizes mutual interrepublic exchanges of groups of writers and book exhibits and holds holidays of national literature.

4. Regularly hears reports on and analyzes the work of the republic writers' unions.

V. In the Field of International Ties

1. Sets up and develops diverse creative ties with foreign public, state, and private literary and publishing organizations and writers of the socialist, developing, and capitalist countries for the purpose of the broad exchange of cultural values, creative experience, and the achievements of multinational Soviet literature in the interests of peace, democracy, friendship, and mutual understanding among peoples and the struggle against the nuclear threat and for the survival of mankind. For these purposes the Union does the following:

- determines the basic directions, forms, and scope of its international activity and coordinates the international activity of the republic unions and the organizations equivalent to them;
- concludes bilateral and multilateral agreements on cooperation;
- holds international meetings, symposiums, seminars, creative laboratories and the like in the USSR and participates in similar events abroad;
- organizes independently and takes part in holding international book exhibits and fairs;
- sends abroad and receives in the USSR delegations of writers and publishing house employees;
- promotes international cooperation in the field of literature, literary studies, publishing work, and the book trade;
- receives in the USSR and sends abroad writers and other specialists to give courses of lectures in educational institutions and in addition sends and receives scholarship students;
- publishes and disseminates abroad informational propaganda materials on multinational Soviet literature and publishes and disseminates in the USSR informational materials on foreign literature.

2. Recommends the works of Soviet writers for translation into foreign languages.

3. Participates in the development and fulfillment of state plans of cultural ties with foreign countries in the field of literature, literary studies, and book publishing; cooperates with the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship with Foreign Countries and other public organizations involved in international ties.

4. Resolves questions of the feasibility of joining international and regional nongovernmental organizations of writers and on withdrawing from them. 5. Along with the VAAP [All-Union Agency for Authors' Rights] monitors the observance of authors' rights of Soviet writers abroad.

6. Establishes and awards Union prizes for the best translations of Soviet literature abroad.

VI. In the Field of Social and Domestic Activity

1. Makes decisions on establishing houses of creativity, recreation centers, boarding hotels, dachas, sanatoriums, polyclinics, hospitals, dispensaries, nursery schools, kindergartens, pioneer camps, and public catering enterprises within the USSR Literary Fund system.

2. Through the USSR Literary Fund does the following:

- helps improve the living conditions of the Union members, participates in construction on a share basis, and organizes cooperative housing, cooperative dachas, and cooperative garage construction;
- offers Union members and members of their families passes to general sanatoriums and children's institutions, establishing payment benefits for them;
- gives Union members material aid, issues loans, and organizes benefit funds.

3. Devotes all kind of attention to writers who are veterans and organizes councils of veterans and helps them work.

4. Carries out measures to perpetuate the memory of prominent Soviet writers.

VII. In the Field of Economic and Financial Activity

1. Organizes and supervises the activity of the USSR Literary Fund, whose basic task is creating the necessary material-technical and financial base for carrying out the organizational-creative and social-domestic activity of the Union. The Literary Fund capital can also be used to give financial aid to journals, newspapers, and publishing houses under the Union and to individual writers.

2. Sets up its own enterprises and supervises their work.

3. Along with the republic unions builds new enterprises and general sanatoriums (among them those built on share principles with other creative unions and other organizations).

4. Under the authority of the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union are the following subordinate entities:

- the Sovetskiy pisatel Publishing House, which operates on the basis of a statute ratified by the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union;
- the Literaturnaya gazeta Publishing House, which operates on the basis of a statute ratified by the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union;

- the Literary Institute imeni A. M. Gorkiy, which operates on the basis of its own charter, and the Advanced Literary Courses under the institute;
- the All-Union Center for Propaganda of Artistic Literature, which operates on the basis of a statute ratified by the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union;
- the USSR Literary Fund, which operates on the basis of its own charter;
- the Central House of Literary Figures, which operates on the basis of a statute ratified by the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union.

5. Formulates, ratifies, and executes its own budget, for this purpose using capital which is formed from the following:

- revenue from the entrance and annual membership fees of the Union members;
- deductions from the profits of its own enterprises and organizations;
- other deductions and benefits which may be received by the Union according to the established system;
- other revenue from citizens and organizations.

The USSR Writers' Union and its enterprises, organizations, and institutions in accordance with the decree of the USSR Soviet of People's Commissars of 17 February 1935 and Decree No 213 of the USSR CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers of 14 February 1987 is exempt from state and local taxes, fees, and duties; a local tax is not levied on shows, meetings, or performances organized by the USSR Writers' Union and the organizations and institutions subordinate to it.

6. Carries out foreign economic activity, using the capital of its hard currency fund.

Section 3. The Organizational Structure of the USSR Writers' Union

1. The Union unites the republic writers' unions, which preserve their own creative and organizational independence within the limits of their jurisdiction determined by the present Charter.

Taking into account the significance of Moscow and Leningrad as the major centers of literary creativity and book-publishing activity, the writers' organizations of these cities are equivalent to republic unions.

2. The supreme organ of the USSR Writers' Union is the All-Union Congress of Writers, which is convened once every 5 years.

The decision to convene a regular congress is made by the plenum of the governing board of the Union no later than 6 months before the start of the congress's work.

An extraordinary congress may be convened at the request of no less than half of the members of the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union and the central auditing commission or at the request of no less than five republic unions and organizations equivalent to them.

3. The norms of representation in the congress are determined by the governing board of the Union. The delegates are elected by secret ballot at the congresses of the republic unions and organizations equivalent to them.

4. The All-Union Congress of Writers does the following:

- discusses the most important problems of the development of Soviet literature and the future tasks of activity of the Union;

- ratifies the Charter and when necessary makes amendments and changes in it;

- ratifies reports on the activity of the governing board and the central auditing commission of the USSR Writers' Union and the governing board of the USSR Literary Fund;

- establishes the numerical makeup of the governing board and of the central auditing commission of the USSR Writers' Union and determines the voting procedures;

- elects the governing board and the central auditing commission. The number of candidates stipulated in advance who receive the highest number of votes (but no less than half plus one) are considered elected. When votes for the corresponding number of places are equal there will be a runoff;

- determines the numerical makeup and voting procedure and elects the governing board of the USSR Literary Fund.

5. The Union governing board is the Union leadership organ between congresses. A plenum of the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union is convened at least once a year.

6. The governing board of the USSR Writers' Union does the following:

- determines the way decisions of the Union congress are carried out;

- studies the annual reports of the secretariat on its activity;

- submits to the Union organs of state power and management proposals on the development of literature, publishing activity, and the book trade and on improving conditions of activity of the Union and its members;
- coordinates the activities of the republic writers' unions and the Moscow and Leningrad Organizations;
- ratifies the Union's annual budget, the distribution of capital, and the plan of basic measures;
- ratifies the structure of the Union's working organs;
- proposes candidates and then elects USSR people's deputies;
- when necessary makes the decision to remove Union members from the governing board or co-opt them into the governing board;
- 2 years after the elections of the Union leadership organs examines the question of the practical activity of secretaries and decides the question of reelection of those who have not proven themselves in the Union's social activities;
- determines the numerical makeup of the secretariat and elects by direct and secret ballot the first secretary and the secretaries of the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union from an unlimited number of candidates.

Representatives of the writers' organizations of all the Union republics and organizations equivalent to them are elected to the secretariat of the Union governing board.

Candidates for the post of first secretary of the USSR Writers' Union governing board are obliged to acquaint the governing board with the program of their activity. Candidates who have gotten the greatest number of votes in the established numerical makeup (but no less than half plus one) are considered elected to the secretariat.

The first secretary and the secretaries of the Union governing board can be elected for no more than two terms in a row;

- the USSR Writers' Union governing board ratifies the editors in chief of journals and newspapers which are the USSR Writers' Union organs, the makeup of the governing board and the managers of the Sovetskiy pisatel Publishing House, the rector of the Literary Institute imeni A. N. Gorkiy, and the chairman of the governing board of the USSR Literary Fund.

The editors in chief of journals and newspapers which are USSR Writers' Union organs, the chairman of the governing board of the USSR Literary Fund, the managers of the Sovetskiy pisatel Publishing House, and the rector of the Literary Institute can as a rule occupy their posts for no more than 10 years in a row.

7. The secretariat of the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union does the following:

- as the executive organ of the Union governing board, supervises all the ideological-creative and organizational as well as social-domestic and economic-financial activity of the Union in the period between plenums of the governing board;
- monitors performance of the decisions of congresses and plenums of the Union governing board;
- coordinates the activity of the secretariats of the governing boards of the republic unions and organizations equivalent to them;
- sets up Union organizations and enterprises to perform the tasks which arise from the decisions of the congress and monitors their activity;
- works out the directions of the Union's international activity;
- carries out joint work with other creative unions and USSR state and public organizations;
- represents the Union governing board in state, public, and international organizations;
- ratifies and awards Union prizes as well as confirms recommendations to nominate candidates for Lenin and USSR State Prizes and honorary titles and submits the names of writers for governmental awards and personal pensions;
- ratifies the management workers of the Union apparatus as well as the editorial collegia of journals and newspapers which are USSR Writers' Union organs and the managers of enterprises, institutions, and organizations subordinate to the Union;
- in its work the secretariat is subordinate to the Union governing board;
- in order to efficiently resolve the daily questions and questions stemming from the work plan ratified by the governing board (or by the secretariat of the governing board), the secretariat forms a working secretariat from its own makeup whose decrees within the framework of its jurisdiction are compulsory for all organizations, institutions, and enterprises subordinate to the Writers' Union.

8. The broad writers' community is informed of the decisions of the governing board and the secretariat of the Union governing board through the Union's press organs.

9. The central auditing commission of the USSR Writers' Union does the following:

- monitors fulfillment of the Union Charter and the decisions of congresses, plenums, and meetings of the secretariat of the Union governing board as well as the plans of the Union's basic measures;

- monitors the financial health and economic activity of the writers' organizations and the enterprises and organizations subordinate to them, including the USSR Literary Fund;

- verifies that the Union budget has been executed correctly;

- verifies that requests, applications, letters, and complaints which come to the Union central organs are examined promptly and correctly;

- gives methodological aid to the republic unions and organizations equivalent to them;

- verifies, by sampling, the financial-economic activity of the republic writers' unions and organizations equivalent to them.

10. The central auditing commission elects the chairman and deputies from its own members for no more than two terms in a row. The voting procedures are established by the plenum of the auditing commission.

11. The central auditing commission reports back on its activity to the Union congress.

12. Plenums of the central auditing commission are held at least once a year.

13. The members of the central auditing commission take part in the plenums of the Union governing board with the right of a consultative vote.

The chairman of the central auditing commission and his deputies participate in the meetings of the secretariat of the Union governing board with the right of a consultative vote,

14. The secretariat of the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union forms public commissions which are links of the Union public self-management: legal, social-domestic, foreign, to monitor the admission of new Union members, and the like. The commissions are formed on the basis of equal representation of the republic unions and organizations equivalent to them.

15. The writers' unions of the Union republics and the organizations equivalent to them base their work on the USSR Writers' Union Charter;

- on their territories they carry out all functions of the USSR Writers' Union, proceeding from the particular conditions of their own activities;

- they carry out the social work of writers in professional creative commissions as well as councils and associations;

- admit members to the USSR Writers' Union;

- elect delegates to the USSR writers' congresses.

16. The writers' unions of the autonomous republics and the local organizations of the republic unions are created by decisions of the appropriate congresses of the writers' unions of the Union republics and carry out on their own territories all functions of the USSR Writers' Union, proceeding from their own jurisdiction defined by the higher social organ of the Union.

17. The management organ of the local organization of the union is the conference (general meeting) of members of the union of the given territory which is convened at least twice during the period between congresses of the corresponding republic union which elects the chairman and the responsible secretary. If the organization has more than 40 Union members, then a governing board, secretariat, or bureau of the given writers' organization may be elected.

18. Writers who live in krais and oblasts where there are no writers' organizations because of the small number of Union members are registered as members in the nearest writers' organization.

19. The procedures for electing management organs of the local writers' organizations as well as the voting procedures during elections of delegates to congresses of the corresponding republic unions are determined by the conference (or general meeting) of the members of the local organization.

20. Professional writers' creative associations are set up in the republic unions and in the Moscow and Leningrad Writers' Organizations and are an important link of the structure of the Union. They unite the members of the Union who work in various types of literary creativity (prose, poetry, drama, publicistics, literary criticism and literary studies, literary translation, and others).

The goals of the associations are the following:

- to consolidate the efforts of the Union members who represent the corresponding types of literature in order to resolve the main creative problems;

- to shape high professional ethics in the writer;

- to protect authors' rights;
- to prepare and recommend people for membership in the Union.

21. Sections of creative professional creative associations may be set up in the writers' unions of the autonomous republics as well as in the local organizations of the Union when there are the necessary number of Union members who are representatives of the given type of literature.

22. The professional creative associations hold their own plenums and elect management organs.

23. The chairmen of the professional creative associations of the republic unions and the organizations equivalent to them make up the coordinating bureau of these associations which operate in the structure of the USSR Writers' Union.

24. As the basis of the professional-creative structure of the Union, the associations have the right of legal initiative within the framework of the USSR Writers' Union.

Section 4. Union Members and Their Rights and Duties

1. A Soviet professional literary figure who has created works (published, produced on the screen, or staged) which are distinguished by high artistic merit and ideological significance and who recognizes the Union Charter and actively works in one of its organizations may become a member of the USSR Writers' Union.

2. The governing boards, presidiums, and secretariats of the governing boards of the writers' unions of the Union republics and the Moscow and Leningrad Writers' Organizations accept people for membership in the Union.

The procedure for admission to Union membership is regulated by a special statute ratified by the plenum of the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union.

3. Persons accepted for membership into the Union receive membership cards of the established form.

4. Union members pay a one-time entrance fee of 5 rubles and annual membership fees of 10 rubles.

5. Rejection for membership in the Union can be appealed either by the writer himself or by the members of the Union and the professional creative associations who recommended him to the secretariat of the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union. The decision of the secretariat of the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union is final.

6. A member of the USSR Writers' Union has the following rights:

- to elect and be elected to the management organs of the Union;
- to make proposals to the appropriate organs of the Union to improve the Union's work and the work of the organizations, enterprises, and institutions subordinate to it;
- to take advantage of all types of creative and other help offered by the Union;
- to take advantage of social-domestic assistance and established benefits;
- to take advantage of the protection of the USSR Writers' Union when his creative and author's rights are infringed upon or his honor and dignity are offended.

7. Union members are obliged to do the following:

- to observe the Union Charter;
 - to fulfill the decisions of the Union management organs;
 - to actively participate in the Union's work and fulfill the social tasks of its elected organs;
 - to promote by personal creative labor the development of Soviet literature and to affirm in it life's truth, humanism, and creative diversity;
 - to consistently support and develop the high esthetic traditions of multinational Soviet literature and eliminate cliquishness, flattery, and other manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism.
8. For violating charter demands and for behavior which injures the honor and dignity of a Soviet literary figure as well as the honor and dignity of the writers' organization, a Writers' Union member can be publicly reprimanded and fined by the management organs of the local writers' organization: he may be reprimanded by the secretariat of the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union, the secretariat of the governing board of the republic union, or the secretariat of the governing boards of the Moscow or Leningrad Writers' Organizations.

9. People are expelled from the Writers' Union in the following cases:

- a writer's deviation from the Union's principles and tasks formulated in the Charter;
- commitment of an antisocial act;
- many years of creative inactivity (other than cases of inability to work because of illness or age);
- regular nonpayment of membership dues.

10. The same organs which have the right of acceptance expel people from the Union and the expulsion is ratified by the secretariat of the governing board of the USSR Writers' Union. The writers' community is informed of decisions on public reprimand and expulsion from the Union through the Union press organs.

11. A person expelled from the Union can join again after 5 years on general principles on the condition that he presents new works.

Section 5. The Legal Rights of the USSR Writers' Union, the Republic Writers' Unions and Organizations Equivalent to Them, and the Local Union Organizations

1. The writers' unions and their local organizations enjoy the rights of a legal person with all consequences on the basis of the laws operating in the USSR and among those rights are the following:

- to acquire and alienate property;
 - to conclude contracts;
 - to set up cost-accounting and cooperative enterprises in keeping with the Union charter goals;
 - to use credit;
 - to set up current accounts in banks;
 - to sue and answer suits in courts and state arbitration commissions.
2. Understandings, agreements, and other financial documents on behalf of the unions and their local organizations are signed by chairmen, first secretaries, chief accountants, and other persons authorized to do so by the secretariats of the governing boards of the unions or the governing boards of the local organizations.

3. The governing boards of the unions and their local organizations have the right within the limits of their jurisdiction to make decisions to set up and eliminate organizations, institutions, and enterprises of the USSR Writers' Union system, to ratify statutes on them, and to set up under the established procedure reserves for rendering temporary financial aid to enterprises and organizations of the Union as well as for professional reorientation when necessary of workers who are released from Union enterprises.

4. The USSR Writers' Union has an emblem, seal, and stamp with the following inscription: "The Order of Lenin and the Order of Friendship of Peoples USSR Writers' Union."

5. The republic unions and the Moscow and Leningrad Writers' Organizations as well as the writers' unions of the autonomous republics and the local organizations of the Union have seals and stamps with the corresponding title.

6. The activities of the USSR Writers' Union, the republic unions, the Moscow and Leningrad Writers' Organizations, and the local organizations can be stopped by decision of the corresponding congresses.

All the money and property remaining after their liquidation is passed on to higher organs of the Union, and the property and money of the USSR Writers' Union is passed on to state organs or public organizations (by decision of the All-Union Congress of Writers).

Philosopher Defends Films Labeled 'Pornographic'

18001023a Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 19, 13-19 May 89 p 6-7

[Interview with I. Kon, doctor of philosophical sciences, by correspondent R. Rykov: "Must One Relax One's Customs?"]

[Text] "Films such as "My Name is Arlekino," "Little Vera," and the like contain more than enough eroticism and sex. But this was not enough for their creators, we are shown intimate scenes openly and coarsely. What kind of morality does such "salaciousness" instill? If this is supposed to be emotional education, what emotions are involved? The box office receipts, which undoubtedly were what the creators of the film were aiming at, are costing us a great deal."

[Signed] B. Demchenko, educator, Denpropetrovsk.

What are the limits of the permissible in the work of an artist? In general, should we relax our moral standards? Our correspondent, R. Rykova, interviews doctor of philosophy I. Kon on these issues.

[Kon] When the films "Little Vera" and "My Name is Arlekino" were released, the editorial offices of newspapers and journals, the Film Makers' Union, and the USSR Goskino were flooded with letters, accusing the film makers of destroying morality and even of propaganda in favor of pornography and eroticism. As a rule, these letters were written by members of the older generation, which is easy to understand. But let us nonetheless try to make sense out of what things "of that sort" the directors showed us. How can "such things" be evaluated?

First off, I want to cool down the inflamed imaginations of some and the aroused ire of others. There is no pornography or eroticism in these films or on the Soviet screen in general. And I think that there won't be in the future, if only because portraying an erotic scene is extremely difficult and our directors and actors are simply not capable of doing so. So what is all the fuss about?

The older generation has become accustomed to the fact that the entire vast sphere of sexual life, which is very important to everyone, is passed over in silence. The

operative formula is: there is no sex here. And everything that appears about "that sort of thing" gives rise to shock. Some rejoice that the keyhole has been made wider; others grow indignant and demand that the keyhole be filled in altogether. Unfortunately, all this is not new. We have become accustomed to perceiving the naked body itself and any depiction of it as a sexual object and something obscene.

In the 1950s, I remember, one Leningrad esthetician wrote a brochure about beauty and decided to illustrate it. One of the photographs showed Venus de Milo. The management of the publishing house declared that the photograph was pornographic. A scandal developed and matters were taken to the party obkom. Fortunately, the secretary at that time was an intelligent man and everything ended well.

Now cinematography has begun not only to refer to sexuality, but to depict it. Sometimes this is dictated by the exigencies of the plot and sometimes the artist inserts such an episode to demonstrate his own daring. Of course, such pictures themselves will differ in their artistic worth. In my view, "Little Vera" is one of the better Soviet films. And the scene that has generated so much emotion does not seem alien, what is more, it is absolutely appropriate in the film. It cannot be called either erotic, or pornographic.

[Correspondent] Igor Semenovitch, unfortunately, the psychology of the man on the street is such that if something is not accepted in society, this is taken to mean it is immoral. But the saddest thing is that people with this psychology can be found among those who influence public opinion.

[Kon] Alas! tolerance is a rare virtue in general and in this area even more so. Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who in his "Confessions" wrote about certain aspects of his sex life, at the same time argued against a complete translation of the Bible, finding many "unacceptable" parts in it.

By the way, the label "erotic work" was attached to Ostrovskiy's "Thunder" and "The Girl Without a Dowry." Today even the most overzealous moralist does not accuse these works of violating morality.

The time has come to understand that for art there are no forbidden themes, the question is only how to portray them. I am always struck by the hypocrisy of our society, which is not at all upset by the fact that, due to the absence of sex education, our country has the highest abortion rate in the world, but let any scenes that are somewhat sexual appear in the movies and society begins to howl about declining morality.

When the entire intimate side of human life is perceived as something shameful and clandestine, this has a ruinous effect on the actual behavior of people. For example, if a young married couple has difficulties [in this realm],

and the husband goes off to get advice from his pals, and the wife from her friends, then how are they supposed to discuss these problems among themselves. Moreover, they will even be incapable of speaking with physicians specializing in sexual dysfunction.

The fact that the old taboos are now being "exploded" is unavoidable. We must be aware of the fact that in this country there is an enormous gap between the generations. The young people are more relaxed and free than their fathers and grandfathers.

[Correspondent] But how can the inexperienced viewer distinguish what is innovation that does not violate the laws of art and what borders on the offensive and vulgar?

[Kon] There is only one way—to study. In 1970, I published an article under the title "Sex, Society, Culture," in the journal *INOSTRANNAYA LITERATURA* (Foreign Literature). At that time, one comparison was expunged from it. I wrote that if the author of an industrial novel describes human experiences in connection with work, then this is an artistic work; if however he speaks primarily of technological processes, and people exist only in relation to this theme, then it would be better to call this work a technological treatise. The same is true in the realm of art. When human relationships and experiences related to sexuality are depicted, then that is art; but if it is simply a demonstration of sexual technology, then that is something else again.

I have seen nothing of the sort in our films. Of vulgarity there is as much as anyone could want, and not just in the area of sexuality. By the way, the scenes that shocked our film goers were not at all erotic. Eroticism is titillation. And who would want to be in the place of the characters in these films? In "Little Vera," the sexual scene is played against a background of the characters' hopeless despair. Nor is there eroticism in the film "My Name is Arlekino." The scene in "Dolly" is perfectly chaste; here it is only a matter of the breaking of the social barriers between student and teacher. What are we so disturbed about? About the possibility of adolescents "getting the wrong idea"? But in the past the leaders of our country long used such a "concern" to justify the refusal to give us adults accurate information about our own life. Has this helped us a great deal? We can keep a young boy from seeing a film, but we will never succeed in sheltering him from the contradictions in real life.

[Correspondent] But doesn't it seem strange to you that adolescents are not allowed to see films that are about people their age because they contain sex and violence?

[Kon] It is our typical hypocrisy: just in case, let's keep them from seeing the film, even though there isn't anything in it that adolescents don't know about. In the film "My Name is Arlekino" there is much violence, and fighting, but the director made nothing up: In the adolescent's environment all this actually exists. After all,

for a long time we asserted that we have neither prostitution nor drug addiction, not child abuse in the family. And then it transpired that we have all that here, and it certainly didn't just arise suddenly when we began talking about it. In one pioneer camp, a seventh grader organized something that was not far short of an orgy, in which half the boys and girls of his brigade took part. It turned out that he had been debauched by his family.

I repeat, what we have to fear is not the truth, but the relishing of violence and vulgarity. No taboos can help here. Someone will make films geared solely to make money, passing off all-permissiveness as artistic freedom, but it takes true talent, as it always has, to create art. By the way, the best erotic scenes that I have seen were in films that did not bear the label "erotic." These were simply very good films.

I think that the viewer will seek out the "salacious" so long as this fruit is forbidden to us. And when the ban is lifted he will learn to distinguish art from artifice, and a reevaluation will naturally occur.

Director Gives Views of Perestroika in Theater

18001023 Moscow IZVESTIYA in
Russian 11 May 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with Evgeniy Lazarev, actor and director, by T. Minayeva: "There Are Special Requirements of an Artist"]

[Text] The social transformation currently taking place has had a twofold effect on the theater. There have been changes within the theater itself—both administrative and artistic. In addition, the activist position taken by the artists enable one to speak of the theater's direct participation in the restructuring of life in general. And each dramatic work is evaluated through the prism of today's times.

People's Artist of the RSFSR, actor and director Ye.N. Lazarev contemplates the problems in the art of today.

[Minayeva] Evgeniy Nikolayevich, we speak of the democratization of life—glasnost, pluralism, the economic independence of enterprises, the participation of labor collectives in their own management, and election of leaders at all levels. How is this process occurring in the theater?

[Lazarev] The paradoxical situation of the theater today lies in the fact that during the years of stagnation the stage often became a battlefield against this stagnation, and yet after the opening of the flood gates of perestroika the theater turned out to be least capable of living according to democratic principles. One is reminded of Napoleon's joke that democracy is a very good thing, but is completely unsuitable for the army and the French Comedy...

Let us be direct: in many theaters the circumstances and means of resolving conflicts are as far from the ethical principles of Stanislavskiy, as the administrative command method is from socialist management.

The conditions under which artists existed within the system of official lies, in which with one hand they attempted to stage "slightly leftist" productions, while with the other they looked after their own prestige and security, did not pass without a trace. Is it possible for a member of the intelligentsia to secure honors for himself, keep track of the progress of paper work through the hierarchy, nag the director and secretary of the party bureau about why he has not yet received the honor? And this kind of thing was considered nothing to be ashamed of, it was the norm! And yet, we artists have a special responsibility and the demands made on us are special too.

Not long ago I went to Tashkent and Alma-Ata. How eagerly they come to see us, dramatic artists, there in the workers' auditoriums. And yet they do not go to the theater, they have a kind of distrust of theaters; in our remote regions we have ceased to be a theatrical nation. Entertainment programs and rock groups have filled the airwaves, starting with the program "120 minutes" early in the morning and ending with "Before and After Midnight" late at night. We are systematically weaning the viewer from spiritual labor. Doesn't this have to be one the more urgent problems of the day? But no, for some of my colleagues the chief issue is who will go on an artistic tour to New York and who to FRG, or where to find the most obliging cooperative.....

Today the theater is sincerely striving to undergo perestroika. At least the establishment of the Union of Theatrical People (UTP) is an organizational precondition for this to occur. The UTP is also doing a great deal to organize our foreign tours, has been inviting foreign troupes here, and has begun an exchange of students in theatrical institutes. The Soviet-American theatrical initiative embodies a remarkable idea. I cannot omit the social aspect of the UTP's work: now actors will receive a pension equal to their wages—the differences will be made up by the union. Allocations of stays in "creative houses" [resorts for artists] will be fairer—in the past these resorts were real summer places for the elite from the capitals and their families. Are these changes right? Yes, they are. Do I support them? With all my heart.

I recall how O. Yefremov, from whom I took a seminar, read us the definition of the word "intelligentsia" from a dictionary. The classical definition has appended to it a note concerning the Russian intelligentsia. Special emphasis is placed on the fact that this class is distinguished by capacity for self-sacrifice. Think about it, they are talking about the distinguishing feature of a whole class of people! A person is truly a member of the

intelligentsia if he adheres to this spiritual principle whatever the circumstances. Often, we lose sight of this principle in situations where questions of salary increases are involved...

The evaluation criteria and artistic sensibility of the leaders and artistic councils are not as high as they should be, since decisions are often based on personal and group interests. It is no secret that when a new play is to be staged in a theater, the actors react first in terms of "what part is there in it for me?"

[Minayeva] You have had the occasion to work with various groups: first you were an actor and director in the Theater imeni V.I. Mayakovskiy, then the chief director of the Moscow Dramatic Theater on Malyy Bronnyy. There you were responsible not just for your own role as an actor and not just for your production as a director, but for the whole theater. What is the reason for your "step backward" to work as an actor in the Theater imeni Mossovet?

[Lazarev] When I worked in directing and teaching. (I teach at the Lunacharskiy State Institute of Theatrical Arts), I thought only of laboratory and studio work. But the chief director has no opportunity to do such work. He is pushed by the cart that he himself is pulling. He can only do laboratory work when he himself has established the studio or theater where his students work. I became convinced that it is unnatural to have a chief director, the position is only natural when the director is surrounded by those who think as he does.

Before I was named chief director I had already staged about 20 productions in Moscow and abroad. I had been given the artistic responsibility for a large group of actors in the Theater imeni V.I. Mayakovskiy. And when I was offered the job as head of one of the Moscow theaters, I naively decided that I would get a creative laboratory. In actuality I was separated from the roots that nourish me, where my worth was known to everyone and I knew the worth of everyone else.

[Minayeva] Undoubtedly, you have also been thinking about the relationship between glasnost and dramaturgy. Lately, one gets the impression that putting on a play about Stalin and those who surrounded him is virtually an obligation of every director today. And productions have appeared that reek of sensation-seeking and opportunism, whereas the true desire of an artist to be in step with the times and express his own position is missing.

[Lazarev] If anyone thinks that there should be limits to glasnost, he must be afraid that his turn will come.

As for sensationalism, then I am an opponent of any sort of cheap success. Perestroika is picking up speed. The whole purpose of art, all its energies were always directed to one thing—being a court of morals, attempting to speak the truth by whatever means. And suddenly the doors opened, the bans were lifted. The social value of

yesterday's "topical" play and the way they were executed artistically are all changing. People from the stagnant time sought "artistic" ploys to hide their true problems; they warped the plays, changed their names and endings. There existed a well-developed technology based on untruth. The years of expedience and participation in the pseudopublicist plays that comprised the majority of the so-called "social imperative" plays led to a situation where the actors were emotionally hobbled. The art of creating an image, that is the ability to reproduce the details of existence, to depict a given environment in all its range disappeared.

[Minayeva] Glasnost aids in the development of a new way of thinking, which is not "collective," but unique to each individual. Why then do the traits of conservatism, neophobia, and unwillingness to change cling so tenaciously to life?

[Lazarev] It would be possible once again to complain of the absence of goods in the stores and of the lines, to refer to the "good old days" of the past and use this to explain our unwillingness to move ahead. But it is well known that one cannot win without losses and expenditure of great will-power and efforts. I am sometimes disturbed by the masochistic fixation on one's own blunders, ??the lower working form of each in his own place.?? And yet one must, first and foremost, seek the reasons for failures in oneself. In short, today it is not always and not everywhere possible to find the common national impulse of patriotic striving to improve compared to other peoples. There are still strata and zones where the circulation of perestroika does not always reach. But in addition I am struck by the fact that our society has retained so much moral health, so much civic daring, the capacity to think in a statesmanlike way and generate an enormous number of ideas in all areas of our lives. All this has made the whole world respect us in a new way.

Tennis Star's Contract With "Proserv" Delayed
18001117a Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 89 p 4

[Report by TASS correspondent A. Novikov: "The Contract Has Been Set Aside for Now"]

[Text] The most talented Soviet woman tennis player, ranked eighth in the world, Natalya Zvereva of Minsk, who signed a contract a few days ago with the firm Proserv, will not be able to take advantage of it for the time being. This became known after the 18-year old athlete and her father and trainer, Marat Zverev, having arrived the day before from the USA, participated on 26 April at the USSR Goskomsport [State Committee for Physical Culture and Sports] in a discussion of her unprecedented decision to conduct all her own affairs through the international negotiating firm.

Prior to this, the USSR Goskomsport's Foreign Economic Association Sovintersport, which handles its contracts with foreign countries, concluded a contract for the country's entire national tennis team with another well-known firm, AMG. Therefore, the decision by Zvereva—a member of the national team—may be regarded as a violation of the collective commitment. But, it must be noted that even the activities of Sovintersport itself in matters regarding ensuring the appropriate rights of athletes who go abroad are frequently subject to well-deserved criticism.

It turned out the the young athlete will have to make a more careful study, with the help of specialists, of the details of the agreement signed by her with Proserv. A resolution of the matter favorable to Natasha and in line with the spirit of sports "perestroyka" will depend to a large extent on a meeting, necessary in this situation, of the interested parties: USSR Goskomsport, Proserv and AMG.

"There was no talk of any kinds of sanctions in connection with my, perhaps, inadequately regulated step," said Zvereva. "I want to go home to Minsk as soon as possible and, later, together with other most talented Soviet women tennis players, I will be training in Tashkent. In the second half of May, there is the international tournament in Switzerland and then the French Open in Paris. My calendar for this year will also include Wimbledon, the U.S. Open and many other of the biggest competitions."

New Complex Proposed for Old Arbat

18001117b Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 17 May 89 p 11

[Letter from A. Ritin, author of the designed proposals, V. Churbanov, doctor of philosophical sciences and director of the Scientific Research Institute for Culture of the RSFSR Ministry of Culture and the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Ya. Panovko, member of the USSR Union of Writers: "An Arbat Alternative"]

[Text] Remember how we rejoiced at the renovation of Old Arbat and its conversion into a pedestrian zone. Today, its "Potemkin villages" are already no longer particularly pleasing to the eye at all and it appears that no one has any suggestions for doing anything. That new culture and that new type of intercourse between people, which we had hoped for, did not arise in this splendid little corner of Moscow. Why? Because, behind the gingerbread walls, there is emptiness. If you do not count the Georgian SSR's trade exhibition pavilion and the solitary cafes.

And so, with this "presence of absence," we intend to overcome by non-prohibitive methods drunkenness, drug addiction, prostitution and other social ills? Are we not just a little too presumptuous?

It is true that we have plans. We have never had a scarcity of them. But when will even one of them be realized? The construction, for example, of a cultural center in the region of Arbat Square has been planned to be implemented only by the year 2000.

The wait, we will tell you straight out, has been long. Is there an alternative? Yes! We are proposing a very elementary thing: the emptiness behind the restored walls must be filled—that is all.

To be brief, the essence of the plan is to establish in the vicinity of Old Arbat a zone of new social culture of leisure and to offer Muscovites and visitors to the capital a whole palette of possibilities for active relaxation. The zone should become an all-union center for "culture of the soul and culture of the body."

Thus, the discussion club "For Everyone" will await visitors from 11 in the morning until 11 in the evening. At the same time, it will also perform informational functions: with the aid of computer equipment, video and other of the latest technical means, it will give out to whomever desires it, for a small fee, information about any question of interest to him concerning how to spend his leisure time.

Here is a center of cultural relaxation and intercourse for interests, where, for a modest fee, the visitor will be able to avail himself of a video library, listen to music, play chess...

The set of special purpose projects for the zone includes six theme stores with 22 shops, located in the "courtly heart" of Old Arbat, in four half-spreading wings.

In addition to these projects, plans are being made to include the daily life itself of the Muscovites living in the zone in the sphere of the improving impact of the new social culture...

Understandably, suspicions may arise: does all this not smack just a little too much of the Benderovian Nyu-Vasyuka's? No! And the competent department agree with this. But what is the result? Their competence is fading only because of the usual departmental disunity.

Today, there already exist dozens of official "declarative" documents with hundreds of signatures. But the matter initiated in April of last year, up till now, has not budged one bit!

There is one way out—the establishment of an organ which has been provided with the necessary powers for the protection of the idea. This may be an amateur association, "The New Social Culture of Leisure." The means and forces will be found by the association itself. Indeed, the approximate cost of the work amounts to just tens of thousands of rubles.

It is necessary to do everything to stop the protracted bureaucratic games surrounding a socially useful initiative. The idea has long since come of age. But they say that full-term children are just as subject to complications as premature children. So who, then, will become the good obstetrician for the "Arbat Alternative"?

Librarians Strike State Library for Foreign Literature

18001117c Moscow *LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* in Russian 17 May 89 p 13

[Article by Yevgeniy Kuzmin: "Culture for Tomorrow"]

[Text] Just a little while ago, we knew that strikes are declared only "in their country" and only by those who have nothing to lose but their own chains. But people in our country, people of a peaceful, perhaps even "philanthropic," profession resorting to such extremist measures?!

Nevertheless, in the All-Union State Library for Foreign Literature [VGBIL]—yes, indeed, a strike!

Against the background of an acute crisis, which encompasses nearly all the leading libraries of the country (the greatest scholars are characterizing this more and more often as a catastrophe in the field of culture, for the libraries are its foundation layer), in the VGBIL, from the outside, everything seemed fine. Inside, however, the foremost workers were sounding the alarm. (*LITERATURNAYA GAZETA* has recounted the problems of the foreign literature library twice—on 11 January and 19 April of this year) The collective has begun to be torn apart by contradictions and differences—both in the diagnosis of what is occurring and in the searches for a way out of the dead end. Tensions have increased and even accumulated under the conditions of the administrative-command management of culture, naturally, and not settled. For the time being...

Not too many people are participating in the strike—23 "all told." For many who would like to join in, this, it seems, is simply more than they can afford. The strike is not in the least being conducted using western tactics, but rather, "Soviet-style"—the people are working, but they are refusing to accept their wages (almost like in the Gelmanov "Prize"). Only, in this instance, the law protects the right of the "strikers" to work. That is, they can not be dismissed for this. And the intelligent library workers are not even about to violate the law in any case and, in connection with each step they take, they are consulting with jurists from the AUCCTC and the Moscow Soviet.

The specific reason for the strike or, more accurately, the last straw, were the unjust, in the opinion of its participants, actions of the administration and the certification

commission with respect to those who criticize the administration sharply. Despite its own "solitary nature," the strike became a catalyst for and detonator of other serious events. One of them was a vote of no confidence in the director of the library, N. P. Igumnova, which was expressed by an overwhelming majority at a labor collective conference.

Could all this have been avoided? Yes. If the director and the USSR Ministry of Culture, which supported N. P. Igumnova, had made a timely effort to meet the collective halfway, by a compromise, and yielded to its demands. But, unfortunately, we—and not just bureaucrats alone!—figure that we can not yield even a single inch to an "enemy" or opponent. But how nice it would be if everyone (not just, of course, in this library) would stop confusing compromises with conformism and perceive them as the triumph of common sense, a victory over personal egoism and vanity, a manifestation of internal freedom and in no instance as a defeat and a weakness unworthy of us. Especially since there are specialist working in the VGBIL, who are responsibly aware that, through their activities, they are laying the foundations for the culture for tomorrow. Where else, in what institution, at one gathering, do people converge who, together, are masters of 140 foreign languages? Is it really not these people who need to be listened to in the first place? They know an awful lot about what needs to be done and how. Really, should not their collective word be a decisive one? Do they understand the problems of library building and the role and place of their own unique library worse than the bureaucrats appointed over them?

They need to create the conditions and not watch indifferently (or, perhaps, even with joy) how the best specialists, poignantly looking for and not finding support for their own aspirations, leave the VGBIL for other cultural centers. To places glad to have them. Where they are awaited.

Now, as planned, in the VGBIL, just as it recently occurred in the Historical Library, elections for the director are coming up. If, of course, the USSR Ministry of Culture does not happen to put obstacles in the way...

I want to believe that our scholars, writers and public figures will display healthy ambition and participate in the elections—in an open competition between plans for the development of the unique library. I still want to believe that the new, democratically elected director will act in close contact and mutual understanding with the labor collective's democratically elected soviet.

...The people have grown tired. They long for peace and quiet. They want to go to work as if they were going off "to work" and not "to war."

Mironenko on Komsomol CC Buro Discussion of Draft Law on Youth

18001075 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 May 89 p 2

[Interview with Komsomol Central Committee First Secretary Viktor Mironenko by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondents V. Tkach and S. Kozheurov: "We Are Not So Rich That We Can Economize on the Future"]

[Text] [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Our society is striving to become a state of law. There is a powerful craving for "good" laws. Our hope is that we will publish such-and-such a law and everything will be fine. But aren't we swinging to the other extreme? Aren't we exaggerating the significance of law-making? Take the Law on Youth, about which so much has been said recently—isn't the very idea of it the product of a kind of "legislative fashion"? After all, we already have quite a few normative acts which regulate the status of youth in society....

[Mironenko] Indeed, the number of them is unbelievably large. On the level of decrees and orders of the USSR Council of Ministers alone our scientists have counted about 1800 acts regulating matters of youth labor. There are even more normative acts by all-union and republic ministries and departments. It's a whole "sea" in which even jurists drown! Among this mass, unfortunately, the proportion of laws passed by the supreme organ of state authority is very small. Moreover, in the course of departmental development and norm-making these legislative acts become "overgrown" with such a large number of restrictions and "refinements" that they frequently come into conflict not only with each other but also the original idea.

Hence, we cannot rely solely on a knowledge of and strict compliance with existing youth legislation, in which much has either been discredited or has not been backed up by truly legal mechanisms. That's one point. Secondly, the idea of the Law on Youth was not born today or even yesterday. And the fact that it is having such a hard time making headway, despite public support for it, gives us no reason for saying that it is ad hoc. We really do need a "good" Law on Youth.

Incidentally, public opinion surveys conducted by the Komsomol Central Committee Higher Komsomol School's Scientific-Research Center in various regions of the country show that only 4.3 percent of those polled between the ages of 14 and 36 consider that the interests of young people are adequately reflected in existing legislation. And only 10 percent of young people are satisfied with how these interests are protected in real life. As for the Law on Youth, between 65 and 84 percent of those questioned are in favor of it, although a substantial portion of them doubt that it can be fully implemented in practice. A healthy skepticism from the "time of stagnation"....

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] But not exclusively, obviously. Doubts about the effectiveness of acts of this type are also expressed by certain political figures in countries where similar laws exist, for example Poland and Hungary. The whole point is what kind of law it is. It is probably no accident that recently we hear increasing demands that the authors of this or that draft law or ukase be named. People ask, Aren't these draft laws anonymous because they frequently have a narrowly departmental, armchair character and are not in accord with processes of democratization in our society? And isn't the Law on Youth threatened by the same fate?

[Mironenko] I think not. The draft of the USSR Law "On Youth and State Youth Policy in the USSR" cannot be called either narrowly departmental or anonymous. Rather, it is an authors' initiative bill [initsiativnyy avtorskiy proyekt] which was worked on by staffers of the Higher Komsomol School Scientific-Research Center, headed by I. Ilinskiy. A temporary creative youth collective was set up consisting of young jurists, sociologists, philosophers, and economists. Under the supervision of D. Pollyyeva, the "Law on Youth" temporary creative youth collective prepared about 10 versions of the bill. All of them were discussed more than once in scientific lecture halls, with the participation of professional, "independent" jurists. All committees of the Komsomol had the opportunity to make comments and proposals. During the final stage, the work was participated in by people's deputies of the USSR elected from the Komsomol. I'll say more: Many items in the bill have received the support of the "informals." They were against the law for a long time. But after a heated and rather critical debate at a meeting of leaders of the informal youth organizations, a secret vote was held concerning the bill, and 65 percent of the leaders of the "informals" voted in favor of the law.

Unfortunately, discussion of the bill in the Komsomol organizations and youth collectives has not proceeded as we hoped. Evidently, however, it is not the fault of the law itself but of our general lack of legal culture. By no means all Komsomol committees have proved ready to discuss this serious legal document.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Dissatisfaction has also been voiced in the Komsomol organizations with respect to the conduct of the bill's discussion. Direct questions have been asked in letters to the editors and at meetings with the Komsomol aktiv: Why isn't the Komsomol Central Committee, which has the right of legislative initiative, submitted the bill for public discussion and published it in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA? Some Komsomol officials are afraid that behind-the-scenes discussion (that's how they define it) of the bill will again result in the alienation of the masses of young people from the Komsomol committees.

[Mironenko] Well, what can I say.... We in the Central Committee believe that in terms of its importance to society this law does deserve public discussion, and we

are speaking out in favor of having it submitted for such discussion. That's the most important thing. That's our position.

On the other hand, fears of, well, more behind-the-scenes activities, someone is trying to maneuver things on the sly—these fears are understandable and can be explained. Although.... In the preparation of any bill, especially the kind which does not yet "blend in" with the system of existing legislation, there are stages to go through. After all, we thought for a long time that there was no youth problem at all. So we had to start from scratch by studying the actual situation of young people in society. In the first stage, work was done by specialists who translated real problems into legal language.... It could have been confined to this. But we decided to take counsel and undertook to have the bill discussed in the Komsomol prior to submitting it to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. Please understand, no one is making a secret of it either in the Presidium or, especially, in the Central Committee. The Presidium came to meet us halfway, deciding to send out copies of the bill to the Komsomol committees. We prepared 15,000 copies. It is in the hands of all members of the Central Committee, all the people's deputies from the Komsomol, and in all the Komsomol committees. Anyone who is interested can go and look at it, and no one can stop them.

It seems to me that questions and fears arise, again, out of our juridical incompetence and our customary suspicion—although, I repeat, it is quite justified. And we in the Central Committee do have the right of legislative initiative. And we exercised it when we prepared the bill with the participation of a maximum number of people in the effort. But the right to adopt a legislative act, that is, to determine the procedures of adoption, including the submitting of it for public discussion, is something we do not have. We will submit the bill along with a proposal that it be discussed by the public, and if necessary we will fight for that proposal. Frankly, we are counting on a first reading of the bill at the first session of the newly elected Supreme Soviet and, after the necessary corrections, submission of it for public discussion.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] In preparing the bill, the Komsomol exercised its right of legislative initiative. But other departments and organizations also have that right. Aren't any of them preparing their own version of the bill?

[Mironenko] Not as far as I know. Discussion is another matter. We sent copies of our bill to 24 departments. We received responses from 20 of them, mostly positive. Objections were expressed by the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Justice, and the All-Union Scientific-Research Institute of Soviet Legislation. The RSFSR Council of Ministers and Gosplan did not respond....

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] How do you assess the comments that have been and are being made with respect to the bill?

[Mironenko] There were a lot of comments during the one and a half years of work on the bill. Some of them are concrete, while others are mostly general or even rather emotional.

We have tried to take account of the concrete comments in the course of reviewing the bill, and this has made it possible to improve it substantially. Just compare the original and the final versions. As for general or emotional comments, they do not so much reflect on the law itself as on contradictory attitudes in society toward the problem of youth policies as a whole.

Incidentally, we do not view the present bill as beyond reproach, much less as a finished document. We assume that new realities of political life and improvement in our society's legal culture will constantly necessitate substantial correctives in it. In addition, the experience of the socialist countries attests to the fact that laws of this sort generally remain in effect for 10 to 15 years, after which they require substantial revision.

Hence, we believe it advisable to adopt this law as the legal foundation of youth policies. And when the law "goes to work," we will all be interested in improving it further. To us, after all, a law is not an end in itself but the first realistic step toward the creation of social legislation and a state of law. Incidentally, this law could serve as the basis for the drafting of appropriate legal acts in the union republics as well.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] But won't a law which reflects the interests of youth constitute a violation of social justice? After all, there are other categories of people in society who also need social support, for example pensioners and invalids.

[Mironenko] This question faced us at the very beginning, when we were only starting to draft the bill. In the finished document there is not a single article or provision which could in any way infringe upon the interests of any other category of Soviet citizens.

It would also be a good idea for our society to think about what the phrase "only for youth" means. According to our statistical data, this segment of society now numbers 67.5 million or 43 percent of the country's able-bodied population. It is absurd even to talk about preferences for that number of people. No economy could stand that. Therefore, as regards the substance of our law, it is not so much oriented toward preferences as toward the creation of mechanisms enabling young people to secure normal living conditions for themselves independently with support from the state.

As far as pensioners, invalids, and children are concerned, I consider it wholly justified and essential to pass laws protecting their rights and interests. For this reason, we view the Law on Youth as one of the first legal acts of social legislation.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Nevertheless, arguments over the consumerist character of the law still continue. Even some jurists are talking about it....

[Mironenko] However paradoxical it may seem, charges like that refer primarily to our attempts to restore social justice with regard to young people. Is it really possible to label as consumerist any attempts to secure fair pay, compliance with guarantees on providing jobs and housing, and support for young families?

I think we need to introduce clarity in this and call things by their right names.

I have frequently had occasion to speak at CPSU Central Committee Plenums and USSR Supreme Soviet sessions and raise the issue of young people's social problems, the fact that the leftover principle of allocating funds for social needs, which has been characteristic of recent decades, has been especially hard on the country's younger generation.

As far as young people's wages are concerned, they are substantially below the national average. Only one out of 10 young workers has a separate apartment, while two thirds are living in hostels or renting, and half of all student families have not been provided with hostel housing. Even if we consider the difficult housing situation overall, the situation of young people looks even more demoralizing.

The problem of young families is an extremely acute one. If a young couple are both in school, their income does not exceed 100 rubles per month. By the age of 30 their wages rarely exceed 200 rubles. The birth of a child reduces their level of material wellbeing by about one fifth. The cost of supporting and educating a child up to the age of 18 ranges between 17,000 and 25,000 rubles. It is hard to imagine, but about half of that total is borne by the parents while they are young. It is not surprising, therefore, that an active redistribution of income is taking place in society, and practically half of all young people are in some way or another obliged to rely for material support on their parents. Without parental "subsidies," many cannot make ends meet at 20, 25, or even 30.

The kind of state policy with regard to youth which would be justified is one which would make it possible to equalize the correlation between young people's income and outgo and would enable them to be materially independent.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] But not, of course, at the expense of other categories of the population?

[Mironenko] Of course not. The bill calls for legal mechanisms that are backed up by economic expedients.

First, the law should stipulate economic instruments and incentives to regulate social processes. Under conditions of cost accounting, young people are generally the first to be let go. Last year, according to data from the USSR Procuracy, one out of every three graduates of secondary schools, vocational-technical schools, and technicums was refused when applying for work. We know for certain that no administrative sanctions, let alone requests, will put a halt to this process. For this reason, we are proposing a different approach. As is well known, in accordance with the new provisions, enterprises will pay the local soviets for labor resources. The bill calls for reducing the payment in cases where young people are hired. In this way, guarantees reserving jobs for young people are backed up by real economic support. And letting qualified young people go will become economically disadvantageous.

Secondly, passing the law will require a substantial redistribution of funds allocated for social needs. It is not a matter of additional appropriations; rather, it is a matter of ensuring maximally effective and correct use of money invested in the social sphere.

Consider the problem of children's homes, for example. Of the 300,000 children being brought up in children's homes, mothers' and children's homes, and boarding facilities, 95 percent have parents who are alive; more than 70 percent of these were born to single mothers. It is easy to guess that one reason for this situation is the financial insolvency of young parents, especially single mothers who receive aid in the amount of 20 rubles per month per child. Yet the state spends up to 300 rubles per month to support one child in children's institutions. If just a part of these funds were transferred to young mothers in the form of aid, I think that the social as well as the economic result would be quite different.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] But in order for the Law on Youth to be more than a mere declaration, it not only needs to be well prepared juridically but also to receive substantial financial support. How much will it "cost," if we may put it that way?

[Mironenko] That, in fact, is the most difficult problem relating to the bill. We have already seen that its most vulnerable aspect is not the juridical but the financial side.

I don't believe anyone today can count the "cost" of the law down to the exact million. And that's not the function of those who draft it. For our own purposes, of course, we have made a rough calculation. It turns out that it will not cost any more than any other "social" law. Nor will it cost more than for the implementation of the latest "project of the century." It must be kept in mind, however, that we are not talking about a one-time allocation of several billion rubles. We're talking about

the redistribution and reorientation of funds, including funds that are already being used for social needs today. Unfortunately, we are not yet able to figure with any accuracy the gains from expenditures, or the losses... from economizing.

The function of the drafters of the bill is to "lay out" the benefits, credits, loans, and major earmarked programs that are necessary to resolve young people's real problems. And it is up to the organs of authority, on the basis of actual possibilities, to decide whether we can or cannot, whether we need to resolve this problem or not. Of course we have to make calculations. That is the business of the appropriate organs. Everything has to be counted up, but in a spirit of good will, I would say. New appropriations add up to one thing, reorientation adds up to another. That's why we need to have public discussion of the bill, so that the people can peruse it, weigh it, and express their opinion, their will. Is it necessary? Yes it is. So let's find out.

Moreover, the bill does not say "immediately" or "right now." It states, "to the extent of development" and "consistent with the possibilities and needs of the regions." In one locality they will decide not to, while in another they will decide it's necessary. And they'll find the funds.

We must give ourselves honest answers as to what we want. Either we will discuss the effective legal basis which makes it possible to start shaping a youth policy (and this requires not only purely legal but also economic levers), or we will gratify the Ministry of Finance with a nice law that doesn't cost anything.

The experience in the socialist and capitalist countries shows that financing a youth policy is an action that is most beneficial both in economic and in social terms. We, however, are lagging substantially behind in this regard. According to the most modest estimates, the amounts of aid for the care of mothers and children in the USSR (for which current expenditures come to about 5.5 billion rubles) in relation to the state's national income are about three times less than, for example, in Hungary and in Czechoslovakia.

In drafting the law, we were not only counting on mobilizing funds but also mapping out vital social programs. The most important of these, in our opinion, is support for young families. At present, according to demographers' data, more than two thirds of all children are born to such families. The present policy in regard to families is not very effective, and it gives little hope for genuine social results. In our opinion, the interests of the whole society require radical reform in measures to stimulate the birth rate and change the unwieldy and incomprehensible aid system. Substantial investments in this sphere are also needed.

The bill calls for the right to go on leave to take care of a child until he reaches the age of three. We made a special study of where to get the money for these programs. I think it will be necessary to break down a number of established stereotypes, for example in regard to children's institutions. There are about 140,000 of them in the country at present, and nurseries account for one third of them. It costs the state about 2000 rubles to create one place in a children's institution. At present about 70 percent of the need for such institutions has been met, and so about three billion rubles have been appropriated for new construction in the 12th five-year plan.

But what if we should give the family the opportunity to choose? Not invest billions in new construction but use these funds to give parents paid leave? There is another eloquent fact in favor of such a decision: Every day, about one million persons do not go to work because of having to take care of a sick child.

And when it comes to additional appropriations for young families, I am convinced that this question should not be decided by the ministries but by all of society, because we are not talking merely of money (even if it adds up to billions) but about the future of our state. Incidentally, during the latest poll of public opinion 88.4 percent of those questioned were in favor of providing young families with substantial financial benefits.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] And how do you envision the role of the people's deputies of the USSR in shaping and implementing state youth policies?

[Mironenko] First of all I should like to emphasize that youth policies are a fundamentally new reality of social life, one which began to take shape in recent decades in a number of capitalist and socialist countries. They are based on a system of large state subsidies and social programs in the sphere of education, science, culture, sports, and labor. The purpose of such policies is to shape a generation which enables the state to make significant steps forward in the intellectual and technological sphere.

Discussion of the causes and basic principles of these programs is a special theme and, frankly, we are not yet fully ready for it. I think that the social scientists will have to study it in depth, especially the youth aspects of integration processes in Western Europe.

The Komsomol Central Committee has repeatedly proposed the formulation of a youth policy in our country, and our proposals were endorsed at the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

There is no reason now to attempt to spell out all the elements of such a policy—what we need is substantial help from scientists and a concerned attitude on the part

of all society. This is why we view the Law on Youth as both a legal foundation for the shaping of a youth policy and as a first serious step in that direction.

During the pre-election campaign, a number of candidates for deputy expressed interest in resolving the problems of youth, and many of the candidates received a vote of confidence from young people just because of this. I should like to hope that they will justify that confidence. Especially in view of the fact that we do have a bill serving as a constructive foundation for debates on the problems of youth policies.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Both the Komsomol Central Committee and you personally, for example, spoke last year at the last session of the Supreme Soviet and expressed support for the creation of a Committee for Youth Affairs. Wouldn't such a committee become another formal entity just like (unfortunately) the corresponding commissions or, even worse, a new bureaucratic office which wouldn't do much for young people?

[Mironenko] But we are not advocating the creation of a ministry or a Committee for Youth Affairs under the USSR Council of Ministers. That would be unrealistic for a number of reasons, including considerations of reducing the administrative apparatus. I personally do not doubt that formations of that sort, under our "traditions," would be destined for the classic bureaucratic fate, and young people would probably not gain very much from such an "innovation."

But when we talk of a Committee for Youth Affairs under the USSR Supreme Soviet, we have two main purposes in mind:

- first, it should be a real organ of people's representation, answerable to and under the control of its constituents;
- secondly, it should have effective legal levers enabling it to influence the policies of ministries and departments with regard to young people.

This is why we proposed the creation of the Committee and, in particular, under the USSR Supreme Soviet. It could be created on a parity basis by the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities to replace the two previous permanent commissions. Such a procedure in regard to forming a deputy organ would to a large extent be consistent with the tasks of shaping youth policies and would impinge upon both state-wide and national-territorial problems of young people.

We propose that in order to represent the interests of young people successfully and expeditiously in the Soviets of People's Deputies it would be justified to have deputy structures within each Soviet, starting with the rayon soviets, to deal specially with young people's problems. They could be permanent commissions for youth affairs or some other kind of formations.

I should like to hope that the Congress of People's Deputies will support young people's desire to have their own representation both in the Supreme Soviet and in the Committee....

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] But doesn't it seem strange to you that the Komsomol, as a social organization which has the right to elect 75 of its own representatives to the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, is deprived of another right—the right to influence its work, say, for starters, the right to name its own candidates to the Supreme Soviet? Doesn't this confirm our worst fears that "quotas" for social organizations constitute nothing more than a means of influencing the qualitative makeup of the supreme organ of government? Of course, preparations for the Congress are assigned to the present Presidium. Nevertheless....

[Mironenko] As is well known, there have been various points of view and proposals with regard to procedures for nominating candidates to the Supreme Soviet. The first was to convene in the territories and, taking account of all the deputies, including those elected from the social organizations, with their participation, to work out proposals from (so to speak) the administrative units. The second.... You're right about that, and our deputies also spoke of it, that it would be good to formulate their own proposals from the social organizations. The Presidium chose the first option. That is its right: to carry out all preparatory work in accordance with the law. When the Congress begins, all the deputies, all 2250, will decide.

But no one has taken away our right to make our own proposals. For this reason, when we met with the deputies and listened to their point of view, we prepared our own Komsomol proposals with respect to candidates both to the Supreme Soviet and to the Committee for Youth Affairs, also other committees and commissions. We sent these proposals both to the territories, asking that our views be taken account of, and to the Presidium.

Will they be considered? If not, then we reserve the right to stand up at the Congress and make our proposals. Just like any other deputy. So I have exercised every one of my rights. The Presidium has its concerns, we have ours. It's up to the Congress.

Can we talk about the Law again?

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Of course. Would you tell us frankly whether you are convinced that this law is really needed by any actual young person? Isn't it something like "making him happy" by force?

[Mironenko] Looking objectively at the factors which led our country to stagnation, one of them undoubtedly is to be seen in the artificial holding back of the rising generation. In fact, the intellectual and professional potential of the most dynamic and well trained segment of society was never called upon.

At present, young people make up just a small percentage of the leaders of production and only about one percent (!) of the composition of most creative unions. Our scientific cadres are aging catastrophically. We have been talking more about the fact that the average age among academicians is 70, and we forget that it is approaching 40 among candidates of science.

In essence, young people have been forced to the lower rungs of production, consumption, and culture. There is no reason, therefore, to be surprised at the loss of the sense of civic worth and intellectual initiative and the rise of conformism. Unfortunately, these realities are not confined to the period of stagnation. These problems are still making themselves felt.

We are not so much frightened by the fact that young people are being charged with drunkenness and involvement with rock or narcotics as by the realization that society no longer sees the younger generation as a real social force capable of serving as the foundation of a renewed state.

Incidentally, this is eloquently attested by the results of elections of people's deputies. The fact that young people add up to fewer than 200 out of the 2000 elected people's deputies speaks for itself. Whatever our attitude toward the Komsomol, or however much we swear at young people, if society loses faith in them it will deprive itself of any hope for a worthy future.

I am firmly convinced that we can speak of the state's prospects only when young people gain a sense of political responsibility for their fate.

In this sense, the Law on Youth is probably an excellent example of this kind of political initiative. To me, this law expresses young people's striving toward civic responsibility, their desire to live in a state of law. It seems to me that the question now is not so much whether young people themselves need the law as whether the state is ready to talk with its young people in the language of the law. And this is incomparably more difficult than to console oneself with paternalistic illusions or get indignant about any manifestations of unsanctioned activities.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] The Komsomol Central Committee will hold its plenum this week, and the Congress of People's Deputies will begin its work the following week. As a people's deputy, what do you expect from the work of the Komsomol plenum, and as the first secretary of the Komsomol Central Committee what do you expect from the debates at the Congress of People's Deputies?

[Mironenko] From the plenum I expect a real political discussion about the fate and the content of the Law on Youth, a frank analysis of the paths of development of the youth movement in our country. I believe that the participants in the plenum are seriously preparing for the

upcoming debates. The Komsomol has a truly unique opportunity to fully exercise its right of legislative initiative. And as a people's deputy and a member of the Komsomol Central Committee, I will do everything I can to help this.

As far as the work of the Congress of People's Deputies is concerned, I should like, first of all, to see the Congress consolidate all segments of society to resolve our shared, literally glaring problems, despite the considerably differing views, opinions, and proposals of the people's deputies as manifested during the elections and, after the elections, during preparations for the Congress. Secondly, I should like to hear the theme of youth resound loudly at the Congress. I think the time has come to think seriously about the country's future rather than to count percentages and quotas. The younger generation does not want to see the country on the fringes of world civilization.

If we say sincerely that perestroika is in earnest and for a long time, then we must rely on those who are to live in the 21st century.

Alienation of Soviet Youth, Corrective Measures Discussed

18000697 Moscow UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 28 Mar 89 p 3

[Article by L. Radzikhovskiy: "The Troubled Time of Adolescence"]

[Text] Adolescent crime is assuming the proportions of an avalanche. Here are some statistics from the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs: adolescent crime increased 1.5-fold during the first two months of this year compared to the same period last year. As a specialist and psychologist who works professionally in this field, I predict with complete confidence that this increase will continue.

There is no need to explain that we are not talking about "normal" adolescent crime, which, in theory, is impossible to completely eradicate, but about a genuine epidemic. Apparently, the issue does not concern the general psychophysiological characteristics of adolescents, which do not change from century to century (instability, increased aggressiveness during puberty, etc.), but social conditions. It is these conditions which are provoking the increase in crime.

Let us imagine that 20-30 years ago the inhabitants of that beautiful university town Kazan said that they were afraid to go out into the streets. No one would have believed them! But today they do not believe there was a time when they were not afraid to... However, Kazan, the "Soviet Palermo", is not unique. It is the same in Naberezhnye Chelny, and a little better in Alma Ata. What can we say, hardly a city remains that has not been

affected by youth gangs and bands. Try taking a walk in the outskirts of Moscow in the evening, it is terrible! And what is typical, who are you primarily afraid of? Adolescents!

In general, the crime can be attributed to a single cause, alienation of adolescents from society.

Our tongues are getting tired of saying these words. Who has not repeated them. And usually they are followed by: we need to understand the poor adolescents, meet them half-way, communicate with them... We do not dispute this. But here is a question: what are we to communicate with? You and I, we are adults, are we not at the crossroads? Do we know how one, "should"? Are we ourselves not the "old adolescents" of today? Do we not exaggerate values? They, the adolescents, "loaf about", so be it. But we don't!

And another thing. Communicate... This sounds as though the poor neglected adolescents were begging us: uncle, talk to me, and the cruel "uncle" walks on by. But often it is the other way round. The adolescents do not want this communication. And often they are right: they already know very well what we are going to say. And more important, they do not have faith, respect or trust in us.

A great change and reevaluation of values is going on in society. And it is as though many, if not most, adolescents are completely indifferent to these "adult games". This is how it would appear. But it does have an effect on them, it cannot help but have an effect on them. "This" pervades the atmosphere. There is a scientific concept, "marginal personality." This refers to a person who is out of his own element, his tradition and culture. Let's say he has come from the village and has not become acclimatized to the city. This is a period we are all going through at the moment. The fear disappears, but a feeling of self worth has not appeared; the old lie has been dispelled, but the new truth has not been incorporated into the conscience. And this happens to everyone, those who "devour" dozens of journals and those who to this day do not understand who Bukharin is and what the strange word "democracy" means. This crisis point operates regardless, for one does not have to know the chemical composition of air in order to breathe...

Of course, these explanations are much too general. We need to do something, take some urgent measures, right now. The overall reduction in punishments, especially for violent crimes committed by adolescents, the reduction stipulated by the new draft of the criminal code, is absolutely unacceptable. Punishment by itself will not reform, but in return its reduction under conditions of a massive increase in crime directly exacerbates the situation. Why push a sled which will speed down the mountain by itself anyway?! Not to mention that "technical detail", the adult mafia will simply hire youths,

inciting them to murder and assault, telling them: well, nothing is going to happen to you kids, no matter what you do, you'll maybe do a couple of years, so what!

Another thing is that punishment measures should be clearly differentiated in accordance with the personality of the adolescent and his environment. And of course, all problems cannot be solved by sending everyone to a colony.

And another important thing. Sentences, threats, charity boxes, "social and political measures", excuse me, but this is all self-consolation and self-deceit. We need something else, work! Independent work for the adolescent for good, "real" money.

The reasoning here is three-fold. If you have earned money, there is no need to beg, steal and speculate. And there is something to lose. There is a different attitude in the person who has nothing (and what happens, he gets something for nothing and does not value it) and the person who has earned it himself. The latter has a way of thinking which keeps him in check. And I believe there is no need to mention the general moral value of work.

Of course, there are several legal and economic problems here. Adolescents are not hired in the workplace, they are forced to study, although now it appears we have abandoned the idea of a "universal and absolute average." And if they are hired, the pay is low. Consequently, it is necessary for the government to financially support cooperatives where adolescents can work. Why cooperatives in particular? Why should adolescents constitute the main strength of these cooperatives? So that they will not be fulfilling various short-term jobs and be in competition, which they know is hopeless, with adult workers. Moreover, in the cooperative, it is not possible for a person to merely "be" there and not work, which is what the adolescent usually does during his "industrial practice."

I will close with this prosaic suggestion. The practical measures I have suggested will probably be insufficient. So let us all put our thinking caps on. There is no time for eloquent words and displays of emotion: the epidemic is spreading.

Crusading Prosecutor Reinstated

18001097 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 May 89 p 2

[Article by Candidate of Legal Sciences L. Nikitinskiy, under the rubric "Characters and Circumstances": "A Cock's Crow Before Dawn: Nine Years of Disgrace is the Price for Honest Performance of Duty"]

[Text] It was simply luck that his former acquaintances did not turn up in the cell with him. The people in investigative cells are a motley crew, and they are probably unanimous on just one point: they do not like

procurators. And the short, fastidious and reserved newcomer Sailkhan Iskenderov was precisely that, a procurator who in the not-so-distant past had been the scourge of the criminal world, and whose portrait had hung for many years on the board of honor in the Azerbaijan SSR Procuracy.

Let me say, getting ahead of myself, that he was not broken either by a week in a common cell with criminals or by the subsequent five months in a KGB investigative isolation cell in Baku. He did not have to get used to isolation: since the time when, after many years of successful investigative work, Iskenderov had become procurator of Shamkhorskiy Rayon in the 1970s, he had constantly felt himself in ominous isolation.

The new Shamkhora procurator realized very quickly where the rayon's epicenter of crime lay. Brazen operations, striking in their scale, involving fictitious goods were being carried out through the cotton receiving centers, and huge amounts of money that were stolen from the state and found their way—granted, in an extremely uneven fashion—into many pockets were corrupting the authorities, embittering the people, and making the whole situation in the rayon extremely explosive (instances of report padding are related in greater detail in T. Gamid's 25 March KOMSOMOL-SKAYA PRAVDA article).

However, the fuss that the procurator made over the inflated cotton figures made no difference to Mamed Askerov, first secretary of the Shamkhorskiy Party Raykom. Shamkhor was visited annually by Geydar Aliyevich Aliyev himself in order to hold the rayon up as an example to others for its high harvest figures. Once in 1975 (a fact that Aliyev himself undoubtedly does not recall) he even granted Iskenderov the favor of a conversation with him and advised him "not to interfere with the fulfillment of the state plan." "I do not interfere in party affairs," the little procurator stubbornly replied to the Central Committee secretary, "but if one-third of the plan for cotton is fulfilled by dint of falsified figures, I believe that one cannot go on that way."

It is possible that if people had listened to Iskenderov back then, today Azerbaijan's Supreme Court would not be having to examine 15 multivolume criminal cases, and to send off to places of incarceration some 150 employees of cotton farms and cotton procurement centers, where hundreds of millions of rubles were stolen with the raykom's full approval.

But under pressure from party agencies, Iskenderov had to withdraw from Shamkhor. Mamed Askerov, the raykom first secretary, also changed locations, moving into the chair of republic minister of agriculture: his rich experience in fraud was duly appreciated. Their paths diverged for a while, but they soon crossed again.

After Shamkhor, Iskenderov was appointed procurator for the city of Kirovabad. The situation there was not easy, and the procurator might not have attached any significance to a report about a den of iniquity in the apartment of a certain Maya Gasanova: such a case was more appropriately handled by the rayon militia division. But during a search of Gasanova's apartment, several notebooks and two pieces of oilcloth with some hastily written notes on the back were confiscated. Along with some notes about the provision of "a suite, boots, brassiere, and shorts" to the "girls" on credit, they contained familiar names, telephone numbers, and certain sums that were in some cases astronomical.

All sorts of people had been guests there: plant, store and farm directors; the chairmen of kolkhozes and consumers' societies; and three raykom secretaries, two ispolkom chairmen, and court, militia and procuracy officials were mentioned among the establishment's clients. Mamed Askerov, the former executive of the neighboring Shamkhorskiy Rayon, had also left his signature on one of the soiled pieces of oilcloth.

Whereas earlier, in investigating the case of report padding, Iskenderov had seen largely the official, hypocritically sanctimonious mask of falsehood, this was where it nakedly held its feasts.

Iskenderov's report to the Central Committee brought prompt action, although not the sort that the procurator expected. The case turned up in a rayon court in Baku, where it was heard quickly and without any noise; moreover, the pieces of oilcloth that were most interesting in terms of their notes disappeared without a trace.

The subsequent sharp turn in Iskenderov's destiny was preceded by yet another event that could scarcely be considered a coincidence. In December 1978 an unprecedented incident occurred at a session of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet: Deputy Gambay Mamedov, the former republic procurator, was so bold as to declare to Central Committee First Secretary Geydar Aliyev, to his face, that the economic successes ascribed to the republic were a thorough fabrication.

Gambay Mamedov was then driven from the podium (about this, see A. Vaksberg's article in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA for 21 September 1988), yet his arguments were persuasive: the republic procurator had been receiving accurate information from the local level. One of those who had been consistently providing that information had been Sailkhan Iskenderov, the procurator of Shamkhorskiy Rayon.

In reconstructing these events, one may suppose that Mamedov's speech at the Supreme Soviet session was a signal for a broader attack on the positions of falsehood in the republic, an attack which immediately faltered. Only Iskenderov, who could not understand the pointlessness and, ultimately, mortal danger of waging a fight alone, raised the banner of truth in Kirovabad with the

stubbornness of a doomed man. A month after Gambay's "rebellion," Sailkhan, speaking at a plenum of the Kirovabad Gorkom, publicly accused a gorkom secretary of (I quote from the minutes) "not caring for the fight against crime that the city procuracy has been waging lately."

After that impudence, Iskenderov's fate was sealed. For the time being, those who shared his views, scattered throughout the republic, took to the trenches—what else could they do? His allies were disunited, nameless and publicly unknown, while among his closest colleagues—

Guseyn Alimardan ogly Ali-Zade was working at the time as Iskenderov's deputy, although Iskenderov did not find him suitable. In March, when, following Iskenderov's speech at the gorkom plenum, a strict inspection unexpectedly descended upon Kirovabad from Baku for quite definite purposes, Guseyn Ali-Zade distinguished himself in an exceptional fashion by losing, "under undetermined circumstances," the service revolver that he, for God knows why, carried. For this he soon received a strict reprimand, "taking into account his positive work and sincere repentance."

That repentance had probably expressed itself in the fact that it was precisely Ali-Zade who had called the inspectors' attention to the case of Pashayev, the former director of the city industrial-goods trade organization who had been released from an investigative cell on a recognizance not to leave the city in connection with the expiration of the period for which he could be held. The inspectors made the point that this smelled of a bribe. Granted, the "briber" himself, in response to all questions, merely shrugged his shoulders in perplexity, but that did not prevent the "suspect" Iskenderov from being expelled from the party and driven from his job.

In November 1980 the judge Ismet Rzayev, in a visiting session of the republic Supreme Court, handed down a harsh sentence for Pashayev, who was accused of grand larceny, and following that he issued a special ruling calling for the arrest of Sailkhan Iskenderov. According to the record of the court session, that took place at 12:00 p.m. in Kirovabad, and Iskenderov, stripped of his rank, uniform and party membership card, was arrested in his apartment in Baku, but a half-hour earlier. No, it is obvious that the eight officers who arrived to take the little procurator away in three vehicles had prepared for that responsible operation well in advance.

Many circumstances indicate that Iskenderov's fate had been determined in advance and, of course, not by Ismet Rzayev, who was acting only as the herald of someone else's will. No one was even bothered by the circumstance that Sailkhan, who had just come out of the hospital, was accused not of bribery (there was no evidential basis for that), but only of abuse of office, and in this case a pretrial arrest, for which there was no necessity whatsoever, was plainly illegal.

But after obtaining the testimony he needed from the convicted Pashayev, V. S. Igonin, the Azerbaijan SSR Procuracy's investigator for especially important cases, dragged out of the archives all the complaints against Sailkhan that had accumulated over 18 years of his work; 17 items were collected in the procuracy. Many convicted persons who had ended up incarcerated with some help from Sailkhan had gotten there the chance to get even—that is why it was necessary to lock the procurator up in an investigative cell. But even from that heap of now-yellowed denunciations, it proved impossible to obtain a single grain of proof.

In early February 1981 the Iskenderov family received a long-awaited reply from the USSR Procuracy: "Procurator Comrade Zamanov has been issued an order to change the measure for ensuring the appearance of S. R. Iskenderov to one not entailing the deprivation of freedom." Another month later a laconic reply from the Azerbaijan Procuracy finally arrived: "In response to your telegrams to the USSR Procuracy, I am informing you that your husband has been kept under arrest with justification. Investigator V. S. Igonin."

Not until the end of March, after the Dnepropetrovsk investigator V. V. Litvinenko had come to Baku on orders from the USSR Procuracy, was Iskenderov freed. However, he had to spend additional unnecessary days in the isolation cell while Litvinenko flew to Moscow to get a stamp on the decree that he be freed, since people in Baku refused to stamp the document.

It was 1981, and it was still a long time until dawn, and no one, to be quite honest, particularly believed him; Sailkhan Iskenderov was hurrying, hurrying the dawn with his lonely predawn cock's crow, but this honor and right cost him dearly. A newspaper column is too narrow to describe all of his ordeals: how Kamran Bagirov, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, drove him out of the Central Committee buro, stamping his feet, refusing to even hear of reinstating Iskenderov in the party; how, after this matter had been decided positively in the CPSU Central Committee's Party Control Committee, Iskenderov's elder brother Movletkhan was illegally convicted and then rehabilitated.

The modus operandi was easily recognizable. Last year the republic newspaper KOMMUNIST published a lengthy article describing the methods used to persecute those who had encroached on the despotism during the time when the despots held sway. Several paragraphs in the article concerned S. Iskenderov, but if he were the only one! Following procurator Gambay Mamedov's speech at the session of the Supreme Soviet, nearly 20 of his relatives were subjected to various forms of persecution; they were fired from their jobs, expelled from the party, and some were illegally arrested and convicted—and that is not counting his colleagues and friends, many of whom also felt the press of repression. The general hounding was dictated by the eternal illusion of all

despots: they dream that all they need to do is slaughter all the cocks, and the dawn will never come. But fortunately, the earth goes on turning, not conforming to their petty tyranny, and history follows its course of progress.

On the eve of the new year, 1989, Sailkhan Iskenderov was finally reinstated in the procuracy, and his blue uniform with the three stars of a senior counselor of justice was returned to him. The game, one could say, ended in a draw. The investigator Vladimir Sergeyevich Igonin has received no punishment, nor have the other employees of the republic procuracy who took part in the falsification of the case. Guseyn Ali-Zade also continues to work there. Ismet Rzayev, under whose chairmanship the knowingly illegal ruling calling for Iskenderov's arrest was issued, remains a member of the Azerbaijan Supreme Court. What's more, some of those whose names were written on Maya Gasanova's lost pieces of oilcloth now hold responsible positions.

As we see, no one has lost anything, if one does not count the nine years during which Sailkhan Iskenderov's uniform gathered dust in the closet, while he himself, with his investigative talent, experience and sense of principle that is irreplaceable in a procurator, was excluded from the active fight against violations of legality in the republic. Excluded at the very time that the republic needed such people as never before.

For decades there an arrogant ostentation held sway, wheeler-dealers in the shadow economy amassed ill-gotten wealth, social injustice mounted, and a stratification of property spread by means of theft. Behind a screen of false achievements, people such as Mamed Askerov gave themselves over to frenzied debauchery. With the help of bribes and provocations, people were pitted against one another, clannishness flourished, and mutual hatred was whipped up. All this could not fail to leave an imprint. Isn't this where one finds the sources of the events that shook the country just last year, in 1988? And in the fact that the convulsions of the banished falsehood "suddenly" took the barbarous form of pogroms, I see, perhaps, the desire of certain people to divert the people's attention from Azerbaijan's genuinely painful problems.

The last thing I would want is for readers to see only a local, national coloring in the story of procurator Iskenderov's persecution. Sailkhan's fate naturally reflected the instability of the position of the procuracy agencies in the real structure of power, and the helplessness of procurator's supervision as a whole.

"There is no doubt," Lenin wrote in 1922, "but what...local influence is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, opponent of the establishment of the rule of law...." That is precisely the essence of the matter.

The present Law on the USSR Procuracy emphasizes that "procuracy agencies exercise their powers independently of any local agencies, being subordinate only to

the USSR Procurator General." During the period when the Stalinist totalitarian-type state took shape, Lenin's concept of the independent procuracy was preserved only in form, while in essence it was perverted. The procuracy was not only deprived of the right to lodge a protest to the court against any decision of local agencies, as Lenin had proposed, but it was left, to all intents and purposes, unarmed, since the procuracy increasingly found itself dependent on local authorities in the person of party agencies.

In a state based on the rule of law, the existence of imperatives and rules that block the effect of the law is intolerable. It is necessary to reliably protect the procuracy and the courts against interference in their work by any agencies and officials whatsoever. Let their work be based on the strict but time-tested principle: "Let justice be done, even if the whole world perishes!"

Correspondent in Geneva Examines Attitudes Toward Soviet Human Rights Issues

18001122 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 17 May 89 p 14

[Article by special correspondent M. Maksimov: "If Karamzin Were Traveling Today..."]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] And so, it's the spring of 1989 in Geneva. Hall 17 of the Palace of Nations is filled with endlessly moving people. Their movements are quite orderly: from their delegation seats to the secretariat and the central table where the session president sits. This time it is a Belgian, Marc Bossuit. He presides energetically and extremely skillfully over proceedings that frequently fail to comply with official regulations.

We Against a World Background

However, I was more interested at the session not in the human rights of others but in our own, and in what they looked like with the world as a backdrop. I discussed this with Yelena Lukasheva, LLD, head of the Human Rights Sector of the Academy of Sciences' Institute of the State and Law, and member of the Soviet Delegation, who had this to say:

"We keep saying that we have to learn democracy. Consequently, we are still pupils. Consequently, our political rights have been poorly enforced and our political culture is still embryonic.

"I would like to dwell on the question of what we must do to bring our legislation in accordance with international norms and standards on the basis of the Vienna Final Document, the Helsinki Final Act, and various legal pacts.

"Currently, it is known, a draft law on freedom of conscience is being prepared. (Incidentally, I couldn't get it in Moscow to prevent, as they said, information leaks, so I saw it only here in Geneva.) Well, that document envisages the right to advocate not only atheism but religion as well.

"Along with freedom of speech and conscience our legislation should provide for freedom of opinion and convictions, for the right of citizens to information, that is, the right to know all that goes on in the country, the right of access to one's personnel file, one's foreign travel file, etc. Many in our country see this as virgin dreams, yet in most countries such personal rights are legally enshrined.

"Where else are we vulnerable? In the problem of leaving and entering the country. The thing is that we used to offer numerous pretexts to restrict travel from and into the country. Actually there is only one reason which could be seriously considered: knowledge of military secrets. However, the decision whether you are a bearer of secrets or not should be made not by the department concerned but by some arbitration tribunal. The law should, therefore, state more specifically a timeframe for secrets (it should not, apparently, exceed five years), as well as what areas are confidential. Obviously, when a person is hired he must be warned of possible restrictions on travel from the country.

"In preparing for the 1991 humanitarian conference in Moscow we must learn lessons from the debates at this session. We must not forget the oneness of the concept of human rights. The Geneva session has shown this to be quite possible. Our approaches are the same, because man, as a social creature, must have a single set of rights: the right to life, right to a worthy existence, right to a healthy environment. The quality of a social system depends on the extent to which it is capable of guaranteeing basic rights." [passage omitted]

But What Will Amnesty International Say?

At the session, incidentally, the routine continued. It discussed a report by a special commission that had visited Cuba. Its conclusions did not sit well with the American delegation... A heated debate flared up over the "Rushdi affair." The majority view was unequivocal: it is impermissible to offend the religious feelings of believers, but to demand the death of the writer who, incidentally, made a public apology, is a throwback to medieval inquisition. Many were fascinated by the conflict between Hungary and Rumania. At issue was the status of the Hungarian minority in Rumania. It was strange to see two socialist countries accusing each other at an international forum. But then, who said that there never can be any differences between countries of the socialist community? Are we all so alike?..

There were quite a few illustrious guests at the session. Among those who graced it with their presence were French Prime Minister Michel Rocard, Afghanistan's Vice-President A. R. Hatif, and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister A. Adamishin, who addressed things that aroused the lively interest of those present in the hall: perestroika, the renovation of our life, the efforts to make it more just and more democratic. He said that in international humanitarian cooperation we also sought to direct it towards really improving human rights.

"This assumes freedom of choice and rejection of any monopoly on the truth, the assertion and recognition of political and cultural pluralism. It assumes the strength of policy and persuasion, not a policy of persuasion by force."

You will agree that such aphoristic words have not been often heard in speeches by our official representatives. Moreover, not only the style of the address was new, but its essence. The deputy minister not only declared that the Soviet Union was pursuing a consistent policy of expanding controls in the area of human rights but also reported a major new step in that direction, with the Soviet Union's recognition of the mandatory jurisdiction of the International Court in interpreting and applying a number of important international conventions.

It is said in local journalistic circles that if you want to know what you look like in the area of human rights you should look into a mirror prepared for this by Amnesty International. Our relations with that nongovernmental organization were for a long time, mildly speaking, strained. It had accused us of serious violations of human rights (not, as it turned out, without justification). In response we declared it (with no justification at all) to be an affiliate of sundry special services. All these years Amnesty International was scoring points in the eyes of world public opinion. In 1977 it was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. UN Secretary-General Perez de Quellar considers it to be the most effective organization in the area of human rights.

What is Amnesty International?

Here is how the Italian chairman of the International Executive Committee, Franca Sciuto, answers that and other questions:

"Amnesty International is a worldwide movement of people seeking to achieve, through practical actions, the fullest respect of certain fundamental human rights proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights."

"Is Amnesty International a political organization?"

"We are independent and impartial. We do not support any government or political system, and we oppose none. We engage only in the defense of human rights."

"Who supports you?"

"Our organization has over 700,000 members living in more than 150 countries. They come from all social strata and hold the most diverse views. Their efforts are directed at collecting the funding we need. We do not receive, nor do we seek, contributions from any government."

"What do you do?"

"We gather information about human rights violations all over the globe. If the information is confirmed we contact the appropriate government and ask its officials to see that the subject's human rights are observed. This activity escalates into worldwide campaigns which help innocent people gain freedom and even save lives."

What do we look like today in the stern eyes of Amnesty International? Much better. In its 1987 report it already noted positive changes on human rights issues in the USSR: many "prisoners of conscience" were being released, the attitude to the use psychiatry as a means of getting rid of undesirable persons was changing. Today Mme Sciuto notes indubitable progress in the new draft criminal legislation. True, she was disappointed by the article providing for the death penalty. What about other aspects? No, it was still far from ideal. Fine accomplishments in the human rights area are still an unattainable ideal for many of those gathered in Palace of Nations Hall #17.

Second Digression [passage omitted]

So far everything is correct. Upon arriving in Geneva Valentin Zapevalov, our correspondent in Bonn, expressed surprise: "In the FRG it's cheaper." Indeed, life is more expensive, but mainly for visitors. For the Swiss themselves almost everything is available. The average wage is 4,000 francs. Average rent is 1,000-1,500 francs. An average VCR costs 500-700 francs. And just imagine, there is virtually no unemployment. The country even imports manpower from abroad. From our point of view it offers a rather atypical example of how nonsocialized means of production satisfy the needs of both employers and employees...

We drove to Bern in the LG correspondent's office car. We passed gorges of remarkable beauty, river bends, the white snowcaps of the Alps. It was all just as in Karamzin's time. Except for the road... I say nothing of the road surface: over the thousand kilometers we drove we never once hit a pothole. I say nothing of the variety of services: gas stations offer dozens of services so essential to the mechanized traveler. But I must mention the alphabet of those roads. It is understandable even to those who know no French or German. Everything is made extremely simple, accessible day and night, the signs telling you where to turn off are repeated so that it's simply impossible to miss your turn...

We decided to spend the night in a village called Bierr. We were attracted, you understand, by the name. The "Gasthaus" (four-star quality in the language of professionals) stood in a small square next to the church and store. As the mistress handed us the keys she asked us to fill out a brief form: name, year of birth, nationality, profession, address. When she saw we were journalists she grinned: "Your spies have stopped here before, but never any journalists." A fine sense of humor! We sat in the restaurant, ordered "bier" (with one "r") and talked, in Russian, naturally. At a neighboring table a slightly tipsy young man addressed us: "Russische spionen - ka-ra-sho!" Why such an attack of spymania?..

It turned out that over the last few days the press had been full of reports about "the greatest espionage affair of many years in Switzerland." The papers flashed headlines like "The Russian Connection," "The Soviet Electronic Spy Case," and so on. And there had been a trial. In the dock was a Swiss citizen, an employee of the well-known chemical concern Sandoz. The prosecution accused him of political and economic espionage in favor of the USSR. He had been arrested in April 1987 and the investigation had been going on since then. The Basel court scrupulously studied the 11 counts of the indictment and rejected nine. The defendant was found guilty of professional negligence which could result, as the court's decision stated, in "leaking information about the firm's production plans." The sentence: 45 days in prison, suspended.

Of course, it's not nice when papers start applying labels ahead of time: one can't even have a quiet drink of beer. But the court! How boldly and independently it resolved such a complex case in which the state was especially interested. It was, after all, a question of security! And how high the legal protection of citizens if a court is capable of demolishing in four days a prosecution's case that took two whole years to assemble!

In Bern we were guests of the firm Wivag. It is a well-known company which manufactures printing presses. When you read this article take note that a part of LG's printing was put out by a press from that company. Now we were walking through its shops in the company of Herr Stein, one of its managers, and were amazed. It was quiet where everything is usually clanging, clean where there was supposed to be lots of oily spots and metal shavings. We were also amazed at the small number of workers and large number of glowing computer displays at the machine tools.

The following day, touring another typographical machinery plant, Verag, not far from Zurich, we saw the same remarkable ex-pe-di-en-cy in everything. It was there that we read the words engraved on a metal plate: "Thank you for taking good care of me."

In the Verag canteen, which reminded us of the best Moscow restaurant, our curiosity was satisfied by the plant's commercial directors Ernst and Heinz Mokli. I

asked what, besides this canteen, had the company built for its employees: housing, kindergarten, boarding house, etc.? Nothing, it turned out! Even the canteen was built by a entrepreneur with the company as a partner. As for the rest, besides wages (which are very good!), it is in no ways obligated to provide or build anything. If employees come from another town they rent their own quarters, place their children in various groups (if the wife is tired of staying home), and choose for themselves where to spend their vacation: at home in the mountains, at the lake, or at any European or American beach. Indeed, they have not only the right to all this, but the possibility to exercise that right. And what about the company? It must handle its business: manufacture first-class products and find markets for them. Which is just what it does.

How simple it all is! But it is not only a question of working skills. One should remember that ever since the Congress of Vienna, which in 1815 proclaimed Switzerland's permanent neutrality, it has developed in conditions of peace and stability and participated extensively in international commercial and economic ties. It was neutrality, our hosts stressed, that helped the Swiss consolidate the unity of a nation comprising people speaking four languages and occupy a leading place in the world in standard of living.

Thus, permanent neutrality in foreign policy and the ability to work—a quality genetically transmitted from generation to generation. What else? Yes, with all that wealth, the ability to count money and economize in everything, to make rational use of secondary materials and industrial waste... And also people who think freely, feel unfettered and are capable of taking calculated risks. These, according to the Swiss themselves, are the components of success.

When Silence is Gold

Geneva again, and the Palace of Nations. The Human Rights Commission is drawing to an end. More than 70 resolutions have already been discussed and adopted, 50 of them without a vote! What has the 45th session revealed and to what conclusions has it come? This question was answered on the last day of the commission's work by Feliks Stancvskiy, head of the Soviet delegation.

"New at this session was the manner in which people spoke. They were not confrontational. That is firstly. It is also important that this time the Western nations advocated universalization of all human rights pacts. It was, consequently, conceded that today these documents are enforced not everywhere, piecemeal, if one looks at a map of the world. The U.S. for example, has not assumed obligations under some pacts. Well, now the West-European nations favor their universalization, that is, that they be ratified by all. That is our position, too.

"We did not look bad at this session. When a nation is dealing seriously with human rights no one talks about it. That is a case when silence is gold. But if we started to adopt documents in our country that do not meet international norms then the attitude would change radically.

"Our press often continues to speak of the priority of socio-economic rights, whereas in Geneva we reaffirmed that without resolving the entire range of rights, including civil and political, we cannot ensure our people's active participation in societal matters or a bold civic stance on their part, and this could negatively affect such areas as ecology, science and technology. I am certain that questions of scientific and technical progress are closely linked with the degree to which a person feels himself unfettered, a master of his own affairs. This depends entirely on the degree to which his human rights are safeguarded.

"When speaking of rights we never forget to mention obligations. I consider that in a normally functioning society there can be no juxtaposition of rights and obligations. What is an obligation? It is but the duty of each to take into account the rights of others. That is why for us the unfettering of man is first and foremost the safeguarding of human rights. Without such unfettering perestroika will not work."

Last Digression [passage omitted]

If you haven't seen the Geneva automobile salon then you haven't seen much. I was able to visit it during the initial days thrown open to the news people. It is a sight worthy of attempting to describe it. Imagine the Olympic Sports Palace filled with glittering cars of fantastic shapes. No, those were not models of the 21st century. They were items manufactured by Western companies today. [passage omitted] Incidentally, whatever exhibit I approached I would see a team of Japanese experts squeezed inside the car, taking pictures, drawing and jotting down everything they saw. I did not see any of our people, just as I noticed no one after a half-hour observation of the stand designated "Lada." Several VAZ exhibits, even though specially prepared for the show by a Swiss company, caused no stirrings in the hearts of car enthusiasts. There were no ads, no samovars, to say nothing of other items. Perhaps someone was afraid of subverting representatives of the mass media, of whom more than 2,000 were in attendance! The only thing that drew my attention was the Lada's price. It was the lowest for that class of car. But at auto salons people look at the machine and at how it relates to world standards or, contrariwise, how unlike anything else it may be. Alas, there is nothing we can boast of in that respect.

This is true not only of cars but of other goods which we offer on the international market. At a traditional consumer goods fair in Basel the Soviet stand was, frankly speaking, disappointing. Once again we looked like poor relations. The mediocrity of both the exhibits and their

layout was appalling. The only exception was the stand of the Moscow Eparchy, which attracted universal attention with its fine religious utensils, icons and various religious publications. In the opinion of Archpriest L. M. Kuzminov, secretary of the Eparchy's administrative directorate, who has attended several such fairs, Moscow organizers often have a vague idea of the markets they are looking for. Hence the presence of things for which there are no demand or which cost much more than similar items offered at the fair.

And here is the opinion of Stefan Wilde, the fair's supervisor who has been its deputy director for many years:

"When the USSR came to Basel in 1985 and arranged its exhibit on an area of 1,000 square meters we offered to cut the area in half and to come every year. Why? Space costs a lot of money, more space requires more personnel, etc. Finally, annual attendance means annual publicity, an opportunity to regularly show off the rates of your scientific and technical progress. Incidentally, our partners from the PRC heeded this advice. But you are apparently still 'deciding the question,' because you came back only four years later."

Indeed, as always we are in no hurry, even though time does not wait. It is appropriate to once again quote the wise Nikolay Mikhaylovich Karamzin, who wrote in his "Letters": "If you ask the time of day at noon here you'll be told: 'It is twelve by universal clocks, but one o'clock by Basel's.' That is, the clocks here are an hour ahead of universal clocks."

Perhaps that is the answer?

Legal Scholar Kartashkin on Human Rights

18001166 Moscow TRUD in Russian 31 May 89 p. 5

[Interview with Prof V. A. Kartashkin, doctor of legal sciences, conducted by TRUD correspondent I. Mikhaylov: "Human Rights: Realities and Problems"; date and place of interview not specified]

[Text] Prof V. A. Kartashkin, doctor of legal sciences, answers a TRUD correspondent's questions.

[Correspondent] Both in our country and abroad issues of human rights are being widely discussed right now. In this connection many of our readers wonder about the extent to which Soviet legislation accords with international human-rights documents, especially those that our country has ratified.

[Kartashkin] Right now we are heatedly debating the problems of creating a socialist state based on the rule of law. Such a state is obliged to ensure and guarantee human rights, while the individual is required to obey the law. And one of its fundamental features is the conformity of Soviet legislation to the international commitments that our country has undertaken. The

Soviet Union has ratified basic international agreements in the area of human rights, and having done so, it is obliged to observe them. Back in 1973 our country was the first great power to ratify the Pact on Civil and Political Rights and the Pact on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. These documents contain a list of the basic human rights and liberties.

Immediately following the ratification of these pacts, a good many articles appeared in our press. They typically noted that our legislation not only conformed to these documents but went considerably further. But even then it was clear to legal scholars and specialists that such statements had no real grounds.

[Correspondent] But if that is the case, it was necessary to follow the practice whereby, following the ratification of an act of international law, the country's legislation is brought into conformity with it.

[Kartashkin] You are absolutely right. A number of our legislative acts note that if national law contradicts international legal norms, the international law applies. However, in practice this important legal provision has not been carried out in our country. Not a single court, administrative body or procurator will accept a complaint from a Soviet citizen concerning the violation of his rights and freedoms as codified in international legal agreements that our country has ratified if there is no corresponding norm in Soviet law.

[Correspondent] And what is the practice in other countries?

[Kartashkin] A whole series of countries have an important rule—once the state has ratified an act of international law, it immediately becomes part of national law. In the United States, for example, a citizen has a right to refer in court to international commitments that the country has undertaken. (Granted, it should be noted here that many international human-rights acts have not been ratified by the United States.)

Other states act on the principle that once an international treaty has been ratified it is necessary to adopt appropriate national legal acts.

Our country also follows the principle that following ratification it is necessary to adopt an appropriate legal act in order to bring our legislation into conformity with the international legal norms that have been endorsed. But so far this has practically never been done, and many Soviet legal specialists are currently arguing for a situation in which any Soviet citizen in court could make reference to international norms that we have already ratified.

[Correspondent] In other words, the international legal norms that our state has endorsed should automatically take effect in the country.

[Kartashkin] Yes, that should be the case. However, only in the period of restructuring has it been recognized that in many of its provisions Soviet legislation does not conform to international legal documents that we ratified many years ago. At the beginning of restructuring we spoke of this timidly. Now legal scholars are declaring it openly.

At present one can also hear the view that our social and economic rights fully conform to our international commitments. That assertion contains only a part of the truth. The qualitative implementation of many social and economic rights lags behind the practice of their implementation in a number of Western countries.

[Correspondent] What specific provisions of our legislation fail to conform to the international commitments we have undertaken?

[Kartashkin] First of all, there is the right, codified in the Pact on Human Civil and Political Rights and in the Universal Declaration [of Human Rights], of every person to freedom of belief and the freedom to express his opinions, and the right to hold them without impediment. That norm has not been codified in our legislation. At the same time, we understand full well that freedom of opinions and glasnost have become one of the driving forces of restructuring. But until recently the RSFSR Criminal Code contained articles 70 and 190 (1), which provided for criminal charges to be brought against citizens, to all intents and purposes, for the free expression of their opinions (if those opinions did not agree with officially accepted opinions). The codes of the union republics contained analogous articles. At present, in the period of restructuring, these articles in the Criminal Code are inoperative, as you know. And practically everyone who was convicted under them in the past has been released from incarceration.

In April the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted an ukase making changes in and additions to the USSR Law on Criminal Liability for State Crimes and certain other USSR legislative acts. This law, to all intents and purposes, has rid our criminal legislation of a number of the elements of crimes stipulated in articles 70 and 190 (1) that had created room for the persecution of dissidents. Therein lies the positive significance of the new ukase. New norms stipulate criminal liability for a number of state crimes. Certain of those elements of crimes also exist in a number of capitalist countries, such as the United States and Great Britain.

At the same time, I am particularly concerned about Article 11 (1) of that law, which stipulates criminal liability for insulting or discrediting certain state agencies and public organizations, as well as a number of officials. One can already see the danger that certain zealous bureaucrats will try to regard the criticism of officials as discrediting them, regardless of the clarifications that have recently been made.

[Correspondent] You mentioned the fact that as of today there are no so-called political prisoners in our country. But the Western press continues to write that we do have them.

[Kartashkin] Recently a delegation from the organization Amnesty International visited our country. They once again presented a list of 100 people who are regarded abroad as political prisoners. But we know that these citizens have also committed other criminally punishable acts, and that is why they are still incarcerated.

[Correspondent] A year ago the Ukase on the Procedures for Organizing and Holding Meetings, Rallies and Street Marches and Demonstrations was adopted, along with a directive to the effect that journalists must have special passes in order to attend public activities that are under militia protection. To what extent do they conform to international norms?

[Kartashkin] So far many flaws have been identified in the Ukase that was adopted. Unfortunately, the opinions of prominent legal scholars were not taken into account when it was drafted. Article 50 of the USSR Constitution contains a whole set of rights that our citizens possess. The right of every person to freedom of speech, press and demonstration. But they are all of a general nature.

First of all, it must be said that what the ukase on holding rallies and demonstrations should have established was not procedures for authorizing them, but procedures for registering them. What does that mean? Any organization or collective that wants to hold a rally or demonstration should merely notify the local soviet that it intends to organize, for example, a demonstration. That request should be registered. Under such notification procedures, no authorization is required. However, our legislation took a different route. Although notification procedures exist in all the leading Western countries, such as France, the United States and Great Britain—Of course, demonstrations can be forbidden there, but only after notification. The free holding of rallies and demonstrations is codified in the international documents that I have already mentioned.

As for journalists' obtaining special passes, the Final Document of the Vienna meeting that was adopted in January notes: states will provide for journalists to carry out their professional activities in such a way that they can freely obtain access to public and private sources of information. And from that standpoint, of course, demanding that journalists have special passes each time they enter a zone protected by the militia is indisputably a violation of the Vienna Meeting's Final Document.

[Correspondent] What other provisions of the Final Document would you like to single out?

[Kartashkin] It states, for example, that each person has the right to freely leave and return to his homeland, as well as the right to freely move about within the borders of his state. Our country, as you know, signed the Final Document, and the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee instructed the ministries and departments to take practical steps to implement its provisions. The document adopted in Vienna also speaks, for example, about the obligation of states to make decisions within three days on applications to visit a family member who is on the verge of death or is severely ill. In addition, if someone is refused permission to leave the country, state agencies are required to inform the applicant in written form of the reason that has been done.

Unfortunately, our practice in this area still fails to conform to the international commitments we have assumed. The provision adopted in 1970 and amended in 1986 is still in effect. It requires the existence of valid reasons, usually an invitation by relatives or other persons permanently residing abroad. In a number of socialist countries, such as Hungary and Poland, every citizen may receive a passport to visit all the countries of the world I have seen that for myself.

Another problem for our citizens is free residence within the borders of our country. Practically no other country in the world has such an "invention" as a residence permit. Yet the obligation of states to provide people the right to move about freely within their borders and to choose their places of residence is stipulated in human-rights pacts and in the Final Document. Up until 1932 our people lived without residence permits. Therefore, the view you sometimes hear that without residence permits there will be a population outflow from some regions into others seems contrived. This issue, of course, must be resolved constructively, with a view to present-day realities.

[Correspondent] What course of action do international acts recommend when it is necessary to restore a violated right?

[Kartashkin] All international laws in the area of human rights give a citizen the opportunity to restore a violated right through the courts. Although we have adopted the Law on the Procedures for Appealing to the Court Concerning Illegal Actions of Officials That Infringe on Citizens' Rights, it provides no procedures for restoring any of the violated rights through the courts. Yet that is the principle of any civilized state. It is the court, as a truly independent agency, that is capable of objectively approaching the solution of disputed issues.

[Correspondent] Where do you see our solution of many problems in the area of human rights?

[Kartashkin] First of all, in improving our people's legal sophistication. A good deal has been done lately and is continuing to be done to improve Soviet legislation in the area of human rights. This is a very important

political and legal issue. I believe that when new legislative acts are drafted, the views of legal scholars and specialists must be taken into account, and for their part, those legal scholars and specialists must take a more active stand.

Moreover, legislative acts should be adopted only by the Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

'Pamyat' Member Detained in Riga
18001251 Riga SOVETSKAYA MOLODEZH in Russian 12 May 89 p 4

["Pamyat" in Riga]

[Text] Sergey Igorevich Kudryashov, claiming to be a member of the "Pamyat" society, was involved in a discussion with a group of people on 2 May in Riga at the square near Domskey cathedral and read the manifesto of the society, for which he was detained by officials of the militia. On 6 May the local court fined him 100 rubles for the violation of the ukase of the Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet from July 28, 1988, "On the responsibility for violating the established order of organizations and conducting meetings, mass-gatherings and street processions."

UKSSR OVIR Official Discusses Changes in Emigration Procedures
18110067 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian 16 Feb 89 p 3

[Interview, published under the rubric "Interview of Current Interest," with V. M. Shepel, chief, Visas and Registration Department (OVIR), UkSSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, by H. Tuhay: "The Regulations Are New. But What About Conditions?"]

[Text] This past year, at the request of RADYANSKA UKRAYINA readers, we have twice (in the 6 May and 7 July issues) published materials on the new statutes pertaining to entry into and exit from the USSR. As of this year, new procedures are being used, aimed at further simplifying the procedure of obtaining exit documents. We asked V. M. Shepel, chief of the Department of Visas and Registration (OVIR) of the UkSSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, to comment on these new procedures.

[Tuhay] It would seem that elimination of a number of bureaucratic formalities should have a beneficial effect on the operations of the offices of your department as well. Exactly the opposite has happened: there are fewer papers, but lines have grown longer. Why is that?

[Shepel] Unfortunately, I must confess that this unpleasant situation has been engendered, strange as it may seem, by the very simplification of conditions for leaving the USSR, for in the two years which have passed since adoption of the new procedures, the number of exits has

increased by a factor of four. Just in the course of this past year, the department's personnel have handled more than 3 million persons.

However, although there are now fewer formalities for those wishing an exit visa, the job duties of Visas and Registration Department personnel as well as the work volume required in processing each application have remained practically the same.

[Tuhay] That is, the changes which have taken place are insufficient? Are the conditions of obtaining an exit visa to be simplified further?

[Shepel] Of course. The process of streamlining regulations pertaining to obtaining an exit visa cannot be considered complete; an optimal variant has not yet been worked out. Some work in this area has already been accomplished this year. First and foremost, the formalities of arranging to travel to countries in the socialist community, with which we have agreements on visaless travel, have been simplified. Henceforth such trips can be made on one's internal passport, with local OVIR offices issuing special attachment pages [vkladki].

The problem cannot be resolved, however, by passport attachment pages alone. And, incidentally, at the present time we cannot even fill out such attachment pages, since we don't have any attachment forms. It is true that, on agreement with some socialist countries, the following practice is already being employed for tourists. A foreign passport is issued only to the group leader, while the names of all other members of the group are entered on a list which is certified by the head of the OVIR office.

Excessive centralization in processing documents is also being eliminated. In the past this has been the exclusive prerogative of city (in large cities) and oblast OVIR offices. This meant that it was necessary to send all documents from the rayons "upstairs." As personnel and facilities problems are resolved in the localities, the procedure of processing all types of travel will be transferred over to the rayon offices in the locality of residence.

[Tuhay] Are there any new changes in conditions of traveling to capitalist countries, and particularly as regards emigration?

[Shepel] I must say that a curious situation is presently developing in this area. As soon as the Soviet Union removed emigration restrictions, some countries have been less anxious to accept those for whose right to emigrate they had in the past campaigned so aggressively. These countries include the United States, for that country also has immigration laws and quotas.

Of course the regulation according to which a person who has not submitted a formal invitation document cannot obtain an exit visa is still in effect in this country. This is done out of purely financial considerations: we

do not have that much hard currency, and the ruble is not convertible—with the present substantial increase in foreign travel, difficulties arise with exchange of currency, provision of travel documents, etc.

There is also another aspect to the question: agreement on the part of the country to which a citizen of the USSR is traveling. Regardless of our attitude toward the problems of traveling abroad, a country cannot be indifferent toward how its citizen (and the majority of those who travel abroad retain their Soviet citizenship) is going to be able to handle things from the financial standpoint. Incidentally, U.S. authorities advise persons wishing to travel to the United States not to apply for an exit visa until they obtain a guarantee of financial support from those issuing the invitation.

As of this year all restrictions have been removed as regards visits by private citizens to capitalist countries, including Israel. This means that OVIR personnel will be faced with a steadily increasing volume of work, which understandably cannot be handled without a fundamental revamping of OVIR facilities.

[Tuhay] Thus, from the standpoint of rules and regulations, considerable changes are taking place in OVIR operations. Now we must wait until we, your potential clients, feel these changes, because, quite frankly, we are paying a fee, that is, as often happens in our service sector, people are paying for services which they are not receiving....

[Shepel] I can't deny that. It is true that each citizen pays 30 rubles to process an application to travel to socialist countries and 200 rubles for capitalist countries. In view of the increased number of persons traveling abroad, you can imagine what a substantial addition this is to the local budget. In most cases, however, people applying for travel abroad are not even able to sit down and leisurely fill out the documents, for as a rule they must stand in long lines waiting their turn. Our people hear justified complaints about the poor conditions to which applicants are subjected. We are bringing these matters up with local authorities. Unfortunately, however, we do not always receive adequate cooperation.

[Tuhay] Is this picture typical of the entire republic or only of the Ukrainian capital, where it is as if they deliberately selected quarters unsuited for such a prestigious service as OVIR should be?

[Shepel] On the whole, conditions almost everywhere are below average. Conditions are particularly disturbing in those oblast administrative centers where, because of their geographic location, mutual travel flow is much more intensive than in the republic as a whole. For example, we have sent letters to the executive committees of the Transcarpathian and Lvov oblast soviets, but without any apparent results up to the present time. As for Kiev, here the problem is determined not so much by the authorities as by the construction people, and here is

why. A decision was issued by the executive committee of the Kiev city soviet dated 4 May 1988, calling for major repairs on our old quarters at 34 Shevchenko Boulevard. But as far as actual execution is concerned, we are talking about years of delay. It took several years just to accomplish reconciliation, agreement and revision of the plans prepared by the Kiev affiliate of the Ukrdiprobud Institute of the UkSSR Ministry of Consumer Services. The contractor—the Kievremstroy Administration (V. Khristopov, administration chief)—and the architects were unable to reach an agreement. Go talk to them even now, and each party will give you a long list of objective reasons. But that does not make it any easier on the people concerned. And although they finally began repairs last November, even erecting a tower crane, up to the present time the crane has been "unemployed." To date only 4,500 rubl's has been expended on the total 150,000 rubles cost estimate. As you can see, not much of a rate of progress.

There are also other problems, first and foremost the problem of computerization. And although the first steps have now been taken in this area, an area of such great importance to us, to date there are no grounds to state that things are completed.

But I don't want to end our conversation on a pessimistic note. We are already beginning to feel the results of those restructuring measures we discussed at the beginning of the interview. Therefore, we are hoping to achieve a normal work pace by the end of the year.

3024

UkSSR Education Official on Restructuring Higher, Secondary Education

18110058 Kiev RADYNSKA UKRAIYINA in Ukrainian
26 Jun 89 p 2

[Interview, published under the heading "Interview of Current Interest," with V. D. Parkhomenko, republic minister of higher and secondary specialized education, by RATAU correspondent: "Higher School: Steps Toward Restructuring"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee message of greeting to the All-Union Congress of Public Education Workers stressed: "The activities of the higher and secondary specialized school must be directed toward creating personnel potential capable of accomplishing revolutionary changes in the economy, raising Soviet science and technology up to the world standard, enriching culture, and renewing the spiritual and intellectual life of society." How is the restructuring of higher education proceeding in this republic in light of the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th All-Union Party Conference? V. D. Parkhomenko, republic minister of higher and secondary specialized education, responds on this topic at the request of a RATAU correspondent.

[Parkhomenko] During the time which has passed since designation of the directions to be taken by restructuring of higher education, the tasks of each educational institution have been specifically articulated, their structures are being improved, deformations and bureaucratic overlappings are being eliminated, and organizational work has been completed on the whole. Today our attention is focused on deepening of restructuring, both in the training of specialist personnel and in organization of scientific research. The transition to an improved technology of the learning process has been completed. A new principle of training personnel on the basis of contractual agreements with industrial enterprises is being implemented for the first time in higher education. The mechanism and forms of increasing return on higher educational institution science and bringing it up to the international standard are being worked out. At the congress of workers in public education, at which I was a delegate, it was stressed that the development of economic reform and creation of a new political system demand a very substantial increase in people's overall level of knowledgeability and awareness: on the job and in sociopolitical activities, in interpersonal relations, in relations within the family, and in meeting material, spiritual and intellectual needs. This cannot be accomplished without a school which meets the highest criteria of progress.

Therefore, our attention is focused first and foremost on radical renewal of the content of what college students are taught. This republic's higher educational institutions have proceeded to work on the basis of new curricula, and the personnel training profile has been broadened. Practices pertaining to organization of the learning process and its methodological support, especially in the field of the social sciences, have been revised. Emphasis is being placed on teaching students the ability of scientific thinking. Stress has been shifted to independent study.

[RATAU correspondent] **Is the contractual-agreement principle of training personnel benefiting the economy?**

[Parkhomenko] Without question. Specific-focus training also increases the client's responsibility for ensuring that personnel requirement figures are substantiated, and it increases the higher educational institution's responsibility for quality of training. At the present time more than 70 percent of senior-year students are receiving training on the basis of contracts between the UkSSR Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education and branch ministries.

In addition, now it is possible to respond more flexibly to the needs of the economy in specialist personnel in various fields. For example, just this year the targeted figures were reduced for 60 areas of specialization, while at the same time the figures were increased for 28 of the most promising specialization areas. It is unfortunate, however, that frequently ministries and agencies endeavor to avoid taking part in the final stage of

training students in a production environment. Some even demand compensation for providing practical work experience and even refuse to accept persons previously sent to them for training.

One should bear in mind that it costs as much as 30,000 rubles to train, for example, an electronics engineer or a specialist in the field of robotics. And yet according to the current standard we are supposed to receive only 3000 rubles. But in spite of the fact that this figure is patently understated, enterprise managers attempt to pay even less. Only slightly more than 4 million rubles have been actually paid to the UkSSR Ministry of Higher and Specialized Secondary Education out of the anticipated total of approximately 70 million rubles under the terms of contracts for 1988. I believe that the main reason for this is the fact that many managers still fail adequately to appreciate the importance of expenditures on training specialist personnel. The situation may be helped by the currently-adopted system of direct "enterprise-higher educational institution-student" contractual agreements.

[RATAU correspondent] **Forming of the ideological outlook of the future specialist personnel and their ability to live and work in conditions of broadening of democracy and increasing economic and social responsibility on the part of the individual is no less important. In your opinion, which areas of work with young students are taking on primary significance?**

[Parkhomenko] All of us should work with determination to close the considerable gap between content and forms of education and indoctrination on the one hand and actual life processes on the other. Only under this condition will the problems of forming a Marxist-Leninist worldview and a higher degree of political knowledgeability in the younger generation be resolved in a practical fashion. The specific individual with his specific problems must always be at the focus of attention. The individual must see that people are concerned and placing hopes on him. It is extraordinarily important to maintain social activeness on the part of student youth and not to suppress intelligent initiative. I am convinced that the work of higher educational institutions, all public organizations and, first and foremost, Komsomol must be organized in such a manner that the growing activeness on the part of young men and women maximally helps deepen and accelerate restructuring of all aspects of our lives.

Indifference in this matter, delay, and counting on the cart showing the way to the horse, as they say, are intolerable. Removing the prohibition from discussing and debating sensitive topics, truth and openness combined with party-minded integrity when dealing with students, respect for and faith in them, recognition of their rights and determination of obligation—all this creates the conditions for forming at the higher educational institution a unified collective of faculty and students with common goals and tasks. Development of

student self-government and involvement in the activities of learned councils, with more than 2,100 students currently participating, is a significant factor in helping enhance the role of young people in educational institution affairs.

[RATAU correspondent] **Volodymyr Dmytrovych, one important item is the need to expand the domain of utilization of the Ukrainian language at educational institutions and further to develop bilingualism between the local national language and Russian. A recently adopted Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee decree places particular emphasis on this....**

[Parkhomenko] As for the higher educational institution, one should bear in mind that it is the final link in the public education system. The young people who come to us have already become defined to a considerable degree in their attitude toward choice of language of communication and, unfortunately, this is many times not to the advantage of the Ukrainian language. This is how the situation evolved in our republic over the course of many years, and one must bear this in mind. It is impossible to resolve the problems of language without taking into consideration the structure of the ethnic makeup of faculty and student body and the overall demographic situation in a given region. Ukrainians make up approximately 62 percent of college students in this republic, while Russians comprise 32 percent. The figures for faculty are 54 and 40 percent respectively. In addition, these figures vary substantially from one region in this republic to another. For example, in the higher educational institutions in the eastern oblasts Ukrainians comprise 46 percent of the student body and 44 percent of the faculty, while in the western oblasts the figures are 86 and 74 percent respectively.

I should also note that far from all Ukrainians who enroll in college make use of the right to take their entrance examinations in Ukrainian. Only one fifth write a composition on Ukrainian language and literature. There are also many other factors which oblige us to adhere rigidly to the principle of bilingualism in organizing the educational process, for 20 percent of all students enrolled as freshmen last year had never studied Ukrainian.

Our specialist personnel must possess an adequate mastery both of the Ukrainian and Russian languages. One can bring many arguments in favor of this. One of them is the fact that on the average 14 percent of college graduates are assigned to jobs in other republics.

All higher educational institutions presently have elective courses for those who desire to master or increase their knowledge of the Ukrainian language. Beginning this year, the curriculum at secondary specialized schools includes a required subject entitled "Ukrainian Language and Literature," totaling 200 hours. Publication of teaching methods literature in the Ukrainian language is greatly increasing, two-language textbooks are to be published, and this year materials for lecture

courses in the social sciences will be published in the Ukrainian language. Publishing schedules have been revised with the aim of increasing publication of scientific and scholarly literature in the Ukrainian language. Measures are also being taken to improve the training of teachers of Ukrainian language and literature.

3024

Homebrew Operation Becomes Full-Fledged Business in Uzbekistan

18300613a Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian
28 Apr 89 p 4

[Article by O. Aleksandrov: "The Liquor Business"]

[Text] *The following comes from statistics of the Uzbek SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs:*

"In 1988 administrative measures were taken against 109,944 people (which is 3.8 percent more than in 1987) for drinking alcoholic beverages and appearing in an intoxicated state in public places. In 1988 the number of drivers detained for operating means of transport in an intoxicated state was 48,726, or 27.2 percent more than in 1987."

It is as if the statistical data which are now openly available have removed the veil and exposed in all their ugliness many phenomena which previously were not discussed. The sharp reduction in the production and sale of alcoholic beverages not only has failed to reduce drunkenness, it has actually increased it. The statistical figures provide evidence of this. Homebrewing has reached almost a massive scale and has led to a sugar shortage. Employees in the field of commerce have not been slow to take advantage of the situation. To this very day they leave us scratching our heads over their vague explanations about the lack of stock or, in the opposite case the availability of stock, while inspections by the legal-protection and workers' control organs continue to discover hundreds and even thousands of kilograms of hidden sugar in the republic's stores, and while sugar continues to be distributed to the rest of us on the basis of humiliating ration coupons. For example, they seized from the house of Samarkand resident Mekhriniso Kadyrova not only a distilling apparatus but also 465 kilograms of sugar in sacks. It would be interesting to know whose coupons she used to get sugar in such fabulous quantities, which are a far cry from the 1.5-kilo packages!

Some time ago we were forced to recognize that the drug business exists in our country. Probably it should also be recognized that the liquor business, to use bureaucratic language, exists. "Energetic" people immediately took advantage of the lack of alcoholic beverages. The business has become widespread. At first glance even specialists find it difficult to distinguish a bottle of vodka or cognac which is manufactured under factory conditions, from an imitation bottle, produced under very different

conditions. Nonetheless, these home-grown "factories" manage to obtain not only raw materials for mass production of alcoholic beverages, but also unlimited quantities of packaging, standard labels and even machines for inserting corks. In short, the "brand name" product comes from the hands of "popular craftsmen" of the bottle.

In the Srednechirchikskiy Rayon of Tashkent Oblast the police (militia) discovered a small trailer, which was in no way remarkable from the outside—there are dozens of them on the plots belonging to dacha owners. But this one was special. In the trailer a certain A. Mirzhafarov managed to develop a mini-plant for the production of vodka. Here he had a barrel(!) with alcohol, an electrical machine for corking bottles, an enormous quantity of labels, and previously prepared corks—some homemade and some factory made.

At one time G. Kazakbayev headed the Optika Store in the Komsomolabadskiy Rayon in Andizhan Oblast, but he achieved his true vocation, which was manufacturing illegal vodka. When inspectors in police uniform visited his enterprise, they discovered 399 bottles of vodka, which Kazakbayev had personally manufactured.

Although the manufacture of home-distilled vodka brings substantial profits, nonetheless, it can be troublesome and quite labor-intensive. There are much simpler ways to get rich. The main way is to organize. A criminal organization of this kind was set up in Namangan by B. Abdullayev, the head of the bottling unit of a winery; Zh. Turayev, chief of the warehouse for manufactured output of this same enterprise; I. Bazarbayev, chief of the Namangan Public Catering warehouse and M. Nurmatov, bartender at the Jupiter Restaurant. By itself a listing of the positions of these entrepreneurs gives a picture of the network within the sector. Truly it extends from production to the serving counter. The plant workers were forming alcohol surpluses by setting the inventory norms for it excessively high. By means of all possible combinations every one of the bottles of stolen vodka cost less than half the state price. Bartender Nurmatov acquired a bottle for seven or eight rubles and took 12 and sometimes even 15 from restaurant patrons. During the investigation it was established that in this way the criminal group was able to steal 3,000 bottles of vodka.

Quite a few such criminal groups have been uncovered; in a majority of them the public catering workers function as the salespeople. In the Urma Restaurant in Andizhan the bar-tender A. Sabirov was found to have 350 bottles of illegal vodka.

There are more and more cases of poisoning from illegal vodka, cognac and other home-distilled spirits. And the criminal cases are increasing. An investigation is taking place at the Denau Wine and Vodka Plant, as well as at other similar enterprises in the republic; speculation in alcoholic beverages has acquired a truly massive scale.

Lines at the liquor stores have become quite a common phenomenon. One more kind of shortage has developed in the republic, and this has led to the development of a new type of easy money.

Crime Increase in Uzbekistan Attributed to Alcohol, Narcotics Use

18300613b Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in Russian 11 Apr 89 p 4

[Article by S. Zapolskaya under the rubric of "From Competent Sources": "A Great Noise and Then Silence"]

[Text] Crime in the republic is growing; this was talked about openly at a briefing held in the Office of the Kirghiz SSR Public Prosecutor. Specifically an increase in robbery, violent crimes and hooliganism is being observed. There are many reasons for this. Two of them—drug addiction and alcoholism—were the subject of discussion on this occasion. The fanfare surrounding the campaign against these evils has declined noticeably, while the state of the struggle against both of them, as the legal protection organs admit, has not improved. Instead, it has gotten worse.

Here are just a few numbers: the republic has 2,459 people on the addiction prevention register and 1,204 people recognized as drug addicts, 466 of them adolescents. One hundred fifty-two people have been registered as abusers of toxic substances. Our area leads not only in the use of narcotics but also as a supplier. The highest level of drug use is in Frunze, Osh, Kara-Balta and in the Issyk-Kul Oblast.

What relation does this have to the growth of crime? A direct one. A drug addict requires 150-180 rubles a day to acquire the his poison. Where can such money be obtained? Only through robbery or burglary. In order to achieve his goal the hardened addict will stop at nothing, even murder. As A. Sultanov, head of the Criminal Investigation Department of the republic's MIA (Ministry of Internal Affairs) noted, it is worth stepping up the struggle against wild hemp—they are shifting to medical preparations. And, of course, in this regard nothing can be done without the participation of medical workers. In the past year alone about 400 forged prescriptions were seized, and how many were not discovered? Criminal proceedings have been instituted against two Frunze doctors.

Things are also going badly, it turns out, with the campaign, begun at one time with so much fanfare, against drunkenness and alcoholism. The community raged: some demanded the closing of wine and vodka stores, others supported drinking if done in a civilized manner. The result of that campaign, as the police recognize, was that there was a sharp reduction in the number of crimes caused by drunkenness; discipline at the production unit improved. The situation continued to be relatively good for two years, but since last year, the

curve has shot up dramatically. The passion abated; the community made a sharp change of course and went for an increase in the sales of alcoholic beverages. Once again drunks stagger up and down the streets of cities and villages without fear or embarrassment (200 more people every month, according to MIA data, have started to arrive at the detoxification centers, and every year almost 1,500 people are sent for forced treatment at special clinics). No one knows whether the Society to Fight for Sobriety, which was created at one time, still exists or not. In any case there are no visible traces of its work. All the various commissions that were formed by ispolkoms and rural soviets amount to a formality; they do not bind anybody to anything. In summary—69,000 violators of the anti-alcohol legislation were registered in a year; the percentage of young people booked for legal infractions committed in a state of drunkenness is high. And here it is appropriate to talk about leisure time. In practice adolescents, young men and women have no where to go in their free time. In Frunze, noted A. Sydykov, head of the Department for the Protection of Public Order of the republic's MIA, there are almost no free activities or sports groups. Hardly anyone can afford the prices in the cooperatives.

When I heard about this I recalled the experience of Georgia, which I learned about during a recent business trip (maybe we could borrow it?!). There they chose to draw young people into sports on a massive scale as a way of combating drug addiction and drunkenness. How? No tekhnikum, VUZ or vocational school will accept documents from a candidate for admission unless he has demonstrated a minimum level of competence in a sport, any sport, whatever the individual chooses. For a year the mass media conducted an educational propaganda campaign, and only then did the republic's Ministry of Education adopt and publicize its corresponding decision. The previously-empty pools, stadiums and courts were filled with young people. Soon it became obvious that there was a need to build additional facilities; this is being done, it should be said, without scrimping. The money and other resources are being found.

The educational work being done with people has declined and that is supposedly why they drink and break the law. These criticisms are sometimes voiced from various platforms and written about in the newspapers. Of course, it is necessary to educate those who have not reached the age of reason. But what about adults? It is appropriate to set high standards for them; discipline is needed in the production unit. Recently the number of blue- and white-collar employees found guilty of drunkenness during work hours has increased by one-third. The police levy fines, while the management of the enterprise or institution, along with public organizations, provides encouragement by awarding bonuses at the end of the year or the quarter.

As for drivers, they continue to drink as they used to, if not more. Last year 16,000 people were detained for

driving a car in an intoxicated state. It is not necessary to explain what this can and does lead to.

That is the disturbing picture of our struggle against drug addiction and drunkenness. I emphasize that it is our struggle, because it is unreasonable, at the very least, to accuse only the legal protection organs in this matter. They deal with the consequences, while the causes are to be found in the poor economy, in the lack of order and discipline in the production unit, and in the decline of morals... And also in our long-standing tendency to rush from one extreme to another; first we join with the the whole world in rising to the struggle and then, after we have cooled off, we quiet down.

Alcohol Treatment, Prevention Centers Deemed Outmoded, Ineffective

18300615a Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian
18 Apr 89 p 2

[Article by A.Kheruvimskiy, deputy department chief, Latvian SSR Ministry of Internal Affairs: "Profound Changes Are Needed: Once More About LTPs"]

[Text] I read the article by journalist Ye.Mazhan "To Break the Vicious Circle" (SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, No 87) with great interest. The author raised a pressing issue. However, I would like to discuss this vital subject in more detail.

The attempt to end drunkenness with one blow of an administrative nightstick has led to an unprecedented spread of home brewing, sharply increased speculation in alcoholic beverages and growing drug abuse, especially among minors. I think that this has been universally recognized.

Since 1985, the number of patients being treated at medical and work treatment clinics (LTPs) has increased threefold. It has become necessary to enlarge the network of drug clinics, sobering-up stations and LTPs. The situation is alarming.

It is no secret that the effectiveness of LTP treatment is low. This means that the system itself is flawed. It should be radically overhauled. Recently, mass media has been paying much attention to LTPs. However, many articles pursue the same aim: to elicit sympathy for the patients, for alcohol abusers. No one argues against the need to improve conditions at the LTPs. But this will not solve the problem.

If we see the clinics' patients as invalids in need of gentle treatment, the LTPs should probably be transferred to the Health Ministry. We would be glad to do so at any time. But is the Health Ministry ready to accept this so-called gift? The makeup of patients at those institutions is too idiosyncratic.

Ye. Mazhan correctly points out that "the overwhelming majority of patients have a criminal past." They are a menace not only to society but to their families as well.

The following letter was written by retiree Melicheva: "I committed my son Yuriy to alcohol abuse treatment. I thought I could breathe easier. But he... Ever since he returned at the New Year's holiday, I have been supporting him. He has been spending more time at home than at the LTP. Drunkards have got advocates; they have been given preferential treatment. Those who defend them should be made to live with a couple of such drunkards; perhaps they would think the better of it afterwards."

Let me add that Yu.Melichev, born in 1952, has been tried on five different occasions and is being treated for alcohol abuse for a fourth time. Currently he is under arrest for escaping from an LTP.

The republic's law enforcement agencies get 2,000 letters a year similar to the one written by Melicheva.

Advocates of gentler treatment ask why we need the LTPs at all, or whether it is legal to commit people to those institutions and in effect deprive them of freedom merely because of their disease, or why an escape from the LTP should be considered a crime.

Currently, 2,500 patients are being treated at the republic's LTPs, of whom 300 are women. Some 60 percent of patients have been previously convicted—up to 14 times—and half have been previously treated for alcohol abuse between 2 and 10 times; 28 patients are extremely dangerous career criminals, more than 500 are homeless, over 200 have been sentenced to correctional labor and some 250 owe fines for services rendered by sobering-up stations prior their commitment to the clinic.

Most common violations of LTP regulations include consumption of alcohol-containing products, refusal to be treated, insubordination to authorities, failure to return from short furloughs and escapes. In the first two months of the year, 49 criminal cases have been initiated for escapes, which occurred mainly for the purpose of purchasing alcoholic beverages. All escapees have been detained on the prosecutor's warrant.

LTP patients are mostly persons with perverted psyches, base needs and stunted intelligence. Many have never worked, except at penal institutions.

This is the makeup of LTP patients. When I first visited an LTP and saw hundreds of alcoholics gathered in one place, I was overcome by two sentiments at the same time: horror and pity for those people, who have lost their human likeness. They are both victims and criminals. How much suffering and evil have they caused to those with whom fate brought them together, how many homes have been broken, how many crimes have they

committed and how many children have they deprived of happiness! They themselves have forced state and society to defend against them and to set up LTPs.

Now patients have been allowed to get visits from relatives and to wear civilian clothes; they get furloughs in case of death or illness in the family or natural disaster, as well as weekend stays at home if they have served at least half of their sentence and do not have any violations. They can buy food and necessities at LTP stores, get packages, have unlimited correspondence and communicate with relatives over the telephone.

How did the patients welcome this gentler treatment? To be frank, in poor form. Some 20 percent of furloughed patients report back late or do not come back at all on their own, and 10 percent return drunk. Some of them call home and harass relatives.

Of course, conditions at the LTPs should continue to be improved. It would be nice to replace existing barrack-like structures with rooms housing 4 to 6 patients modeled on those at psychiatric institutions. But I think that civilian clothes should be replaced with hospital uniforms to discourage escapes and AWOLs. We should not reject labor treatment, either, but LTP production quotas should not be patterned on those used at penitentiaries. Treatment is the main business of the LTP and doctors must play the leading role.

Existing LTP regulations are clearly obsolete: they were issued in 1964. A law is needed providing for compulsory treatment of alcohol abusers, which would also define their legal status as well as the rights and responsibilities of the administration. In this area we request the assistance of the republic's Ministry of Justice and the Prosecutor's Office.

I fully agree with Ye.Mazhan that the court should commit alcohol abusers to LTPs without specified terms. Let the doctors decide how long the patient should stay at the LTP. The May 24, 1985, decree of the LaSSR Supreme Soviet's Presidium should be amended to allow lawyer participation in court hearings of cases involving commitment of alcoholics to compulsory treatment and appeal of court decisions. However, I do not think that we should abolish the practice of criminal prosecution for escaping from the LTP. Otherwise only those would stay who are unable to move; yet, almost all patients are a public menace and are capable of committing crimes.

The most acute problem is to find accommodations and jobs for patients released from the LTP who do not have their own homes. Many of them ask to be kept at the LTP since they have no place to live, no one is willing to hire them and the tall fence of the LTP is replaced for them by the bureaucrat's door that is shut tight.

Here, society should show mercy and compassion. We count on assistance from the press and television. But the problem can only be solved by the republic's Council of Ministers. At issue here is the fate of thousands of Latvia's natives whose lives are at a dead end.

Ye.Mazhan's article "To Break the Vicious Circle" proposes to create within the social security system a network of specially reserved homes where social dropouts, the homeless and disabled alcohol abusers could work, live and get treatment. This is an excellent idea. Yet, its implementation entails a considerable expense. Meanwhile, we are short of properly equipped homes for the elderly and single war and labor veterans and for people who have been disabled from childhood. I think that other solutions would currently be more practical.

But the work of the LTPs is not being discussed at sessions of the soviets of the people's deputies, at ispolkom meetings or gatherings of party and economic managers. Little attention is being paid to such institutions by the Ministry of Justice, the State Labor Committee, the courts, ispolkom administrative commissions and commissions to combat alcohol abuse, economic managers and labor collectives. They are poorly informed about the LTPs' problems. And how would they know, except by reading newspapers and numerous complaints, to which they usually give a standard official reply?

The system of compulsory treatment for alcoholism must be changed to emphasize more gentle and merciful treatment of "the green serpent's" victims, but we should also keep in mind that society must be protected against criminals and social refuse.

Leningrad Red Cross Proposes Soup Kitchens to Feed Hungry

18300615b Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 29 Apr 89 p 3

[Article by M.Kushnir from Leningrad: "To the Red Cross for Dinner"]

[Text] We have heard about soup kitchens before: television journalists stationed abroad used to be very prolific on such subjects. Yet, it is no longer a secret that among our countrymen, too, there are some who can barely make ends meet. For them, a simple dinner can be a problem. The Leningrad Committee of the Red Cross Society has offered to help them.

"Of course, we would not be able to set up special cafeterias serving free dinners," said T.Lineva, chairman of the city's committee. "We are talking about special rooms or areas at existing public catering facilities in different parts of the city. Currently, our volunteers are inspecting cafeterias and negotiating contracts with their management. They are also meeting with retirees in an effort to find out in personal conversations who needs

our assistance most. I stress personal conversations since questionnaires and other bureaucratic methods would simply be out of place here.

"It has been decided so far that 60 percent of coupons for two dietetic meals a day would be sold to poor retirees for R9 instead of their full cost of R40 per month. This is real financial support, is it not? The remaining 40 percent would be paid for by the society and the oblast trade union council. Those coupons would be distributed free of charge."

The interviewee shunned from calling such cafeterias soup kitchens. But the name is not important. What is important is to make sure that this good undertaking prospers; it is certain to find followers in other cities, as well.

Deplorable Living Standards Contribute to High Infant Mortality

18300631 Frunze SOVETSKAYA KIRGIZIYA in
Russian 4 May 89 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Are We Deliberately Programming Sickness?"]

[Text] Yes, confirm the participants in a mini sociological survey conducted in Sovetskiy Rayon of Oshskiy Oblast.

The inhabitants of Oshskiy Oblast have not become accustomed to the medical landing parties. For the umpteenth year in a row, the sun will burn a little hotter, and teams of physician-epidemiologists, infection specialists, pediatricians and gynecologist-obstetricians are being sent to the oblast, not only from throughout the republic, but also from many distant corners of the country -the situation has become so extreme here that the curve of indices of mortality, primarily infant, is climbing alarmingly upward.

For decades, these depressing indices have been kept silent, sickness has been driven far into the background, where it continues to progress. But finally, people are beginning to talk openly about the high infant mortality, primarily in the republics of Central Asia. But the discussions are few. In order to successfully combat sickness, it is necessary to research it and know the causes and roots. For this very reason, an unusual landing of physician-sociologists was undertaken at an "inopportune" time, in early spring, on the instructions of the Council of Ministers of the Kirghiz SSR. Specialists from two of the republic's leading scientific research institutes -the ecology and prevention of contagious diseases and obstetrics and pediatrics -conducted a survey in thousands of households in Sovetskiy and Batkenskii rayons. A multitude of data was obtained and processed which will provide a scientific basis for developing a program to fight for our health.

Today, we have asked candidate of medical sciences and head of the department of sociological research of the Kirghiz Scientific Research Institute of Ecology and the Prevention of Contagious Diseases, I. K. Denislamovaya, who is supervisor of the group of sociologists in Sovetskiy Rayon, to talk about this issue. In contrast to many of our colleagues, Ishgul Kapieva was sent to this rayon with a great store of comparative data already accumulated. From 1983 to 1988, she conducted sociological surveys in Tonskiy Rayon, from 1985 to 1987 in Dzhety-Oguzkiy, Tyupskiy and Ak-Suyskiy rayons of Issyk-Kulskiy Oblast and in 1988 in Suzakskiy Rayon of Oshskiy Oblast.

More babies are born in Sovetskiy Rayon, than anywhere else in the republic. Let us compare: whereas last year an average of 19.8 babies were born per thousand people in our country, 32.6 were born in Kirghizia, and 43.4 in Sovetskiy Rayon. The average number of children per family here is more than four. We should be joyous . . . but our hearts are aching! For the mortality indices run in direct proportion to the birth rate indices. The curve of infant mortality in the USSR during the last twenty years has essentially remained the same. In the USA, for example, these depressing figures have decreased during the last fifteen years from 20 to 10.9, in Japan from 13.2 to 6.6, in the FRG from 18.5 to 10.7. But in our country these figures have only decreased from 25.3 to 24.2.

It is good that we have begun to give full voice to this subject. However, there is little ascertainment of the fact that our public health system is unsatisfactory. The time has come to take energetic practical action. And to do this, we need to have a clear idea on whom and on what our, and primarily our children's, well-being depends. We need to recognize priorities in the restoration of our health.

We have long been in the habit of reiterating the low material and technical level of the public health system. We say there are not enough hospitals and polyclinics, they are poorly equipped and there is insufficient medical personnel. And we are deliberately programming society, including the medical services, to . . . sickness. Not to prevention and fighting for our health, but to defects and illness. The result of this "purposefulness" is obvious: we are the most hospital bed-and physician-maintained country in the world, but nothing is being done to increase our health. The time has finally come to change our priorities. Our desires, plus efforts and financial means, should be directed toward prevention! The following figure is no longer a secret: only approximately 10 percent of our health depends on medical institutions, the rest depends on our environment and on ourselves.

Of course, physicians will not be relegated to the back seat in prevention. Who else will carry out propaganda concerning a healthy way of life and confirm it in everyday life by their personal example? Who else will intelligently and tactfully involve themselves in family

planning? It is a generally accepted fact that the most favorable time for child birth is between the ages of 20 and 29. However, in Sovetskiy Rayon, only 51 percent of the women become mothers during this time. While the number of women who become mothers over the age of 35, which is a particularly undesirable time to give birth, is more than 25 percent.

Our mini sociological surveys in Sovetskiy Rayon demonstrated that a great many women have literally made it their aim to somehow become heroine mothers. Despite the fact that the minimum conditions for bringing up children, fostering their intellectual growth and even providing them with enough food are lacking.

Are health professionals justified in maintaining an attitude of neutrality in a situation like this? We need to shout here and convince people of the necessity of efficient family planning. It should be explained that when they grow up healthy and develop their fullest potential, then it can be said that the "family is rich in children", and that words about "primordial love" for children require concrete reinforcement and the creation of at least the basic conditions for their growth and development. Alas, so far the involvement of medical employees in efficient family planning has been practically nonexistent.

Let us take the sanitary-hygienic culture of the population - a sensitive barometer of mortality, primarily, infant: the lower the level of the first, the higher the level of the second. A little more than 43 percent of families in Sovetskiy Rayon have wash-stands and only two percent of these are located in the home, the rest are in the yard. It is obvious that in cold weather they are not used. How can we speak of hygiene in a situation like this? And how can health professionals and other specialists with higher education diplomas confirm the sanitary-hygienic culture by their personal example if our sociological group deems the sanitary-hygienic level of 50 percent of medical employees and 80 percent of teachers unsatisfactory?

Programming for sickness originates in the medical learning institutions. The specialists who leave their walls are literally larded with formulas for every possible ailment: they prescribe medications for us to get rid of influenza and explain in detail what to take for hepatitis. However, they do not advise the primary and most elementary thing: how to prevent these illnesses. This is "studied and assigned as homework" least of all in the academies and institutes.

But if only our health depended on the preventive activity of health professionals alone! The simplest thing is to nod to the physician, "I'll heal myself." The easiest thing is to recommend to someone: "You want to be healthy, then be it." "Your health is in your hands." But it is a well-known fact that our surveys have repeatedly confirmed that a great deal depends on the social well-being of the population. Let us recall that many villagers do not have any water supply, they have to take their

water from the irrigation ditches, not only for hygienic purposes, but even for cooking food (!). How much does this kind of "prevention" cost?

Or these figures. Only a little more than 50 percent of the families surveyed have refrigerators and only five percent use them in the winter for storing perishable goods; 41.5 percent have washing machines, but very rarely use them. Twenty-seven point eight percent of families do not have any furniture in their homes and 66.7 percent of families have managed to provide themselves with some kind of furniture; 74.3 percent eat sitting right on the ground. To what can these facts be credited? To poor culture, tradition and morals? But we often hear something else from the inhabitants: "There is not enough money."

Yes, poverty and disorder in domestic life are glaringly obvious, especially in families with a lot of children. According to our data, only 12.5 percent of families have more than 50 rubles for each member. Where can health be found in such a situation?

Milk kitchens would help a great deal to relieve the problem of infant nourishment. Alas, at present in the rayon not one standard kitchen exists. The material and technical base of the only milk kitchen with 1-1.5 thousand portions a day, which operates, as the saying goes, until the first fire (?), in no way meets the sanitary standards for the huge number of children under the age of two. Thus, approximately 15 percent of children receive free food. Is it any wonder that 44 percent of babies are born and become hypotrophic and anemic by the age of one?

When we informed the party and soviet agencies of the results of our surveys, they refused to believe that the food situation was that serious, referring to the fact that they are in constant contact with the people and had never seen such a thing. But facts and figures are stubborn things.

The time has finally come for the local party, soviet and economic agencies to become involved in the current situation. Otherwise, no material and technical base of medical institutions with the most up-to-date equipment and resuscitation departments and no armada of physicians will be capable of lowering the infant death rate.

What are the main tasks for improving our public health system? The first, in my opinion, is the comprehensive conducting of sociological surveys (our institute is prepared to provide the procedures it has developed for this) with widespread discussion of the information obtained in the provinces and the implementation of concrete measures for improving the standards of living. We need to be concerned about the general employment of the population and about the genuine, not lip service,

development of personal secondary jobs which will really help the family food situation and budget. It is necessary to improve the bringing up of a healthy child in each family and solve the problems of efficient nursing and feeding of young children. Finally, we need to be concerned about raising the overall and sanitary-hygienic culture.

All these problems can only be solved jointly, which means, by society as a whole. To put it in medical terms, only surgery, and not periodic injections, can combat the critical situation which is occurring in our public health system. Otherwise, we will be deliberately programming ourselves for sickness.

Kuybyshev Deputies Prepare for Congress
18001103a Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 May 89 Second Edition p 1

[Article by special correspondents A. Solarev and V. Shilov: "Be Reasonable and Resolute!"]

[Text] Kuybyshev—Although the meeting of USSR people's deputies with the workers had been announced in advance in the local newspapers, it was nonetheless preceded by a considerable amount of conjecture and rumors. Representatives of the so-called "informal" public organizations heatedly discussed contentions that the "apparatus" was doing everything it could to organize things so as to keep undesirables away from the speaker's rostrum and to push through a prearranged, streamlined resolution. An occasion, however, for jousting and the breaking of lances did not present itself. The meeting of USSR people's deputies with their constituents was held, as the saying goes, with the door open. More than 3,000 people gathered at the Sport's Palace. Out of 53 persons registered to speak, 30 presented wishes, instructions, or mandates to Congress deputies.

Kuybyshev Oblast will be represented at the congress by almost 15 delegates. Among them are V. Afonin, obkom first secretary; A. Chizhov, general director of the Progress Association; I. Sorokin, senior executive officer in the Department of Internal Affairs for transport; A. Sokolov, editor of the oblast newspaper VOLZHSKIY KOMSOMOLETS. Other representatives will be drawn from the most diverse sections of the society. These are energetic individuals who enjoy public popularity, capable not only of expressing social concerns but of championing them. Yet on this day there was not enough raising of questions or defining of problems.

Hanging slogans keyed the sentiments of those assembled: "Real Power to the Soviets!"; "From semi-glasnost to full freedom of speech, of the press, and of assembly!"; "Clean air for the city!" Slogans also decked the speaker's platform, where a small group of "informals" huddled. But the question arises: Why did the other organizations and labor collectives exhibit such a passive attitude in terms of agitation? Surely, they cannot be against full power for the soviets or clean air for the cities, can they? This, of course, is just a detail, but it is worth thinking about. On tables in the rear of the hall were special mandate boxes into which anyone who wanted to could drop personal mandates or proposals. Hundreds of them were jotted down and deposited. By generalizing upon these personal mandates, oral or written, it is possible to assign economic and social priorities.

Demands for radical improvement of the ecological situation were especially vociferous and insistent. The oblast has more than 350 major industrial enterprises and 2,500 motor transport organizations, which together each year discharge into the atmosphere more than a million tons of pollutants. Each year, moreover, about a billion cubic meters of drainage flows into the Volga

basin, almost 40 percent of it unpurified. Public opinion in the oblast is extremely upset about this. How is the health of the people to be protected? How are they to be provided with fresh air and clean water? A spokesman for the ecological and political club Alternativ, V. Kartashov, emphasized that on a country-wide scale the USSR State Committee for the Protection of Nature was supposed to play a key role. He called upon the deputies to alter the status of environmental protection by making the committee independent of the departments. V. Kozhevnikov, director of a technical training school in Chapayevsk, was among those participating who spoke in support of protecting the environment. A scholar, a doctor, an engineer, and a teacher expressed indignation over the fact that various departments held control over the entire natural wealth of the region.

Recently, at the initiative of the oblast's new party leadership, certain steps have been taken to be more equitable with respect to allotments. A special hospital and special hostels have been turned over for general use, and quarters once occupied by offices have been taken over as apartments. Several prominent leaders have been discharged from their official positions and punished for exploiting them to improve their housing and living conditions. All this is helping to increase public trust in local party and soviet bodies. The task of social justice, however, is not simply to be equitable in distribution but to create the opportunity for people to satisfy their vital needs. In this respect the oblast is going through a period of serious difficulties. In the first quarter, for example, the cash income of the population by comparison with the same period last year rose by 12.6 percent, whereas deliveries of goods other than food products rose a total of 1 percent. Food stocks are less than those of neighboring oblasts, and the rate of housing construction is unsatisfactory.

While Kuybyshev Oblast has an immense economic potential, the industrial giants often hold themselves aloof, alienating their own workers. Without taking into account Volga Automobile Plant production, only 75 kopecks' worth of consumer goods are made available for every ruble earned in wages. As a result the oblast administration of USSR Gosplan periodically issues brand new paper money. During the first quarter, 33.4 million rubles above the plan were put into circulation in Kuybyshev alone. Coupons have been introduced in the oblast for a number of products and industrial goods, yet even with the coupons it is not always possible for the public to get obtain the goods. In sum, the oblast economy is seriously ailing and for the present cannot properly provide the public with products, goods, and services.

In this respect proposals made to convert defense industries to peaceful production of consumer goods and equipment for food and other light industries were certainly timely. T. Samarkina, a milker at the Kolkhoz imeni V. I. Lenin in Kinel-Cherkasskiy Rayon, declared

that it was particularly important for all the enterprises, irrespective of their departmental affiliation, to work to strengthen the base of social as well as industrial activity.

It was emphasized in the speeches that the deputies should serve not as expeditors or deliverymen, nor as petitioners of departmental offices, but as statesmen. For this reason it was imperative to have a law on the status of people's deputies. Once again there was a convergence of views among those who spoke on behalf of the labor collectives and the informal or non-aligned group. A mandate to speed the drafting of a law on local self-government and economic self-sufficiency, which would serve as an obstacle to arbitrary departmental action by vesting economic power in the hands of the local soviets, was presented in a similarly amicable manner. In the opinion of V. Baranov, a metallurgist, no less than one half of enterprise profit should be left for the producers to meet local needs.

The meeting was conducted in a sufficiently organized way, without the slightest infringement of democratic procedures, proving the fears of the "informal" or non-aligned factions unfounded. Incidentally, such movements as Memorial, the ecological and political club Alternativ, the Tatar Cultural Center, and a number of others are being provided with more and more opportunities to play a creative role in public life. The party obkom has invited representatives of these movements and other informal organizations to join the commissions of the local soviets, study acute problems, make specific proposals, and to participate in the election campaigns of local soviets as nominees for administrative posts. Many of the "informals" were drawn to participate in such forms of cooperation. Some, however, wanted to disrupt the applause, seeking to exploit the social and economic difficulties.

Attempts to make the situation more heated with rowdy behavior did not win the support of the overwhelming majority of those in attendance at the Kuybyshev Sports Palace. As soon as speakers strayed from subject of the meeting or resorted to bombast and empty talk, the hall immediately demanded that they get to the point and stick to the subject. In this connection, not only one of the prearranged, pro forma speakers but also one of the non-aligned activists found themselves in an awkward situation.

The meeting with the people's deputies lasted for two and a half hours. Electoral mandates formed the basis of collective platform of the USSR people's deputies from Kuybyshev. In enunciating this platform, People's Deputy V. Afonin, first secretary of the CPSU oblast committee, declared:

"First of all, we shall advocate emergency measures to improve the health of the economy. We shall strive to

have the labor collectives solely responsible for proprietary control of the enterprises and their material well-being. We shall propose dismantling the system of arbitrary administration by departmental dictation, the liquidation of a number of ministries, and a considerable cutback in the administrative apparatus.

"We shall advocate, further, substantially strengthening the authority of the soviets. Local oblast soviets today have at their disposal only 4 or 5 percent of profits and tax revenues. This is obviously unfair. Quotas should be set not by the departments but by lawful means—that is, by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

"We shall advocate converting the oblasts to regional economic self-sufficiency, and the orientation of their economies to serving social needs. Today Category III (V) industries in the oblast are four times below the level of the country as a whole. No less than half of all capital investment must be directed towards the resolution of social problems and the development of the food industry and other light industries on a priority basis. We believe it necessary to establish by law that no less than 3 to 5 percent of our industrial resources should operate in the interests of the agro-industrial complex. Right now the allotment for this purpose is miniscule—a mere tenth of one percent. We believe it necessary further to supplement capital investments by as much as 10 percent.

"The ecological situation in the oblast is extremely disturbing. In response to voter demands, we shall strive for the adoption of a special decree by the government addressed to this issue.

"To sanction the authority vested in the deputies, we shall submit to the congress a proposal for the passage of a law governing the legal status of USSR people's deputies. Deputies should possess broad jurisdiction; they should be independent; they should be given free and unrestricted access to all state and public documents; they should be able to recruit specialists as required for their operations—that is, all conditions conducive to fruitful endeavor should be put at their disposal. We advocate the adoption of a law on referendums applicable throughout the country as well as to the oblast."

Persons in attendance welcomed this statement of objectives for their own deputies with satisfaction. Summing up the general atmosphere of the meeting, V. Tuluzakov, docent of the Kuybyshev Pedagogical Institute, stated:

"Those selected as deputies have been chosen not because of their official positions but for intelligence and leadership. Remember this. Be at once reasonable and resolute in fulfilling the will of the voters. Your task is not an easy one. And so we say, good luck, be strong, and work hard."

Lensoviet Creates Inter-Ethnic Commission

18001103b Leningrad *LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA*
in Russian 12 May 89 p 1

[LenTASS report: "Building a Common Home"]

[Text] The future work of the Leningrad Soviet's Permanent Commission on Inter-Ethnic Relations in Leningrad was the subject of a roundtable discussion yesterday by representatives of national cultural associations.

"The necessity of establishing organizations such as this one attached to the soviets of peoples deputies at all levels is stated in the resolution of the 19th All-Union Party Conference," V. V. Filipov, first secretary of the CPSU's Krasnoselskiy Rayon Committee, told a TASS Leningrad correspondent.

"In response to this need, a decision was made at the most recent session of the Leningrad Soviet to form our commission. The expediency of such a step is further substantiated by numerous appeals and letters we have since received by Leningrad residents who are disturbed by problems concerning relations between nationalities and ethnic minorities.

"In future we shall seek the counsel at the commission of representatives of the various national societies in the city. The commission will be working in close coordination with a group of experts on inter-ethnic issues. The group includes P. F. Its, supervisor of the Leningrad department of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Ethnography; Yu. A. Petrosyan, department head of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Far Eastern Studies; B. V. Ivanov, deputy director the the USSR Museum of Ethnography; and scientists of Leningrad University."

Readers Evaluate Newspaper's Coverage

18000722 Leningrad *LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA*
12 Feb 89 p 1

[Article by I. Kosenkova: "LENPRAVDA in January"]

[Text] In the 27 January issue we asked you, our dear readers, to evaluate the work of the editors' collective during the first month of this year by answering four questions:

1. Of the articles published in January, which do you consider to be the editorial board's most successful?
2. In your opinion, which important events slipped the paper's attention?
3. What do you think we should direct primary attention toward in February?
4. Which authors did you find the most interesting?

Today, we will let you know the readers' collective opinion. But first, let us mention two facts which attracted our attention as we read your letters. First, you responded efficiently and willingly to our request, especially when you consider that the deadline for receiving your responses was very short. And second, judging from the letters received, our readership has become significantly younger, at least those who are prepared to actively cooperate with us by helping to make the newspaper more interesting. We should also mention that 72 percent of those who responded to the survey were blue and white collar workers.

Now let us look at how you evaluated the newspaper in January.

Judging by the results of the survey, several articles immediately emerged which readers considered definite successes of the collective. The majority of votes went to the interview with academician D. S. Likhachevii entitled "But Good will Triumph All the Same". This was followed by "Amputation" and "Pitiful Leadership", "Pure Word Poetry", "Adult Concerns about the Kindergarten", "Zone of Increased Danger" and "Distorting Mirror".

The survey also revealed an undisputed leader among those given a negative rating. This was the article "Under the Shadow of the Majestic Cranberry." Every fourth letter which arrived in response to the questions mentioned it. Only two of them absolutely supported the author. There are maximalists who believe that "The Cranberry" cancelled out all the January achievements of the newspaper and almost became the "mouthpiece for those who oppose restructuring." Of course, the criticism expressed by those readers, and they were in the majority, who reproached us for failing to present our own definite opinion on this issue, was much more justified. We received several hundred responses to this article. We will return to this subject in February.

The readers edited the second question in the survey. They maintained that it should not have concerned the events omitted by the newspaper, for it is impossible to report on the unreported, but should have focused on development by the newspaper of those important subjects which Leningraders have found unsatisfactory. These three subjects were mentioned.

The main one, campaigns for electing candidates as USSR people's deputies. Those responding to the questions made several serious claims for articles on this subject. In particular, the insufficient, from their point of view, objectiveness, openness and glasnost. For example, in some letters this "semi-glasnost" is featured in the article "On Equal Grounds", about how a contest had taken place for the right to elect a candidate as people's deputy between the chairman of the Leningrad gor-ispolkom and an engineer of the Izhorskiy zavod association.

We do not believe that those are right who maintain that the outcome of the campaign was decided ahead of time. Neither do we agree with those who describe the situation as "playing at democracy". We think that we simply have not had enough experience yet in pre-election campaigns.

From the readers' point of view, the newspaper has not given enough attention to the candidates' pre-election campaigns and to relating their promotion by the workers' collectives. We accept the rebuke. In the final analysis, we are all learning democracy, so, let us learn together

Fifteen percent of those who responded believe that we are keeping such an important subject as ecology in the background. The readers were not satisfied with the articles about Lake Ladoga, the Finnish Gulf and the dam, believing them to be inconsistent and superficial. In their opinion, the material about enterprises which pollute the air also suffered from the same shortcomings.

Leningraders' dissatisfaction with the activities of societies and organizations assigned to protect the environment has almost become traditional. In particular, the recently established Committee for the Protection of the Environment of Leningrad and the Leningrad Oblast, whose work is still cloaked in secrecy, according to the readers. Judging from the survey, the interview with its chairman V. P. Vorfolomeev, did not shed any light on this issue. After it was published, readers again worried: isn't too much of the Committee's attention being directed toward forming the administrative machinery and won't this protection of the environment end in yet another "mechanical" measure in the spirit of stagnant times? In short, you suggested that the paper give concrete expression to its approach to such an urgent problem as ecology and not lose control of it.

And another painful "point" for Leningraders is the planned construction of a recreational tourist complex at Licyy Nos. Every fifth person who responded to the survey mentioned this problem. They believe that LENPRAVDA has to some degree fulfilled its duty toward the readers by publishing a review of readers' letters "Discussion Pressed for Time" on 1 February and the interview "If Only We Can Wait Until July" on 8 February of this year. But we also agree with the readers' suggestions to return again to this discussion with a greater number of participants, including opponents to the idea of this construction.

In February, according to the opinion of the majority, the newspaper's main attention should be directed toward preparation for the USSR people's deputies elections: the paper should familiarize readers with the candidates and their campaigns, provide an in-depth explanation of the election process of candidates itself and also enter into constructive dialogue with readers about how to achieve strict observance of democratic principles during the conducting of the elections.

What, in the opinion of those who responded to the survey, would make the newspaper more interesting? This would be stories about the destiny of the suggestions and instructions of the delegates of the 28th Oblast Party Conference, the position and specific participation in the contemporary life of the city of the administrators of the oblast, city and rayon links and familiarity with their political profiles. Among the subjects announced for this month are primarily the course of economic reform, ecology, organization of the city's public amenities and services, solving of housing problems, restructuring of the public health service and a discussion of legal reform.

Our most popular author in January was academician D. S. Likhachev.

These are the results of the survey. All of your suggestions, dear readers, will be reviewed by the editorial board. You will later be able to judge the degree to which we take them into consideration in our work. We would like to thank all those who expressed their opinion about January's LENPRAVDA and invite everyone who wishes to participate in the next survey. It will be devoted to evaluating the work of the editors' collective in February.

Remember that your answers should be sent no later than 1 March with "SURVEY" printed on the envelope. Please do not forget to include your age and profession.

WE ARE WAITING FOR YOUR LETTERS!

Currency Exchange Regulations Changed

18080057 Riga PADOMJU JAUNATNE in Latvian
25 Apr 89 p 1

[Interview with Yuriy Vishn'akov, deputy chairman of the Latvian Republican Bank Board of the USSR External Economic Activity Bank, by correspondent Vija Paikena; date, place not given]

[Text] Rumors had already been heard earlier, but last week they received a confirmation. Yes, in the Soviet Union the regulations for exchanging currency have been changed. I asked Yuriy Vishn'akov, deputy chairman of the Latvian Republican Bank Board of the USSR External Economic Activity Bank, to tell us more about it.

[PADOMJU JAUNATNE] First, briefly—about the previous currency exchange regulations....

[Vishn'akov] Until April of this year, citizens who traveled to socialist countries by personal invitation could exchange 15 rubles per day, but for no more than 90 days. Therefore, every year each citizen could exchange 1,350 rubles and take along three ten-ruble notes: 1,380 rubles altogether. Persons who traveled to capitalist nations could exchange 7 rubles per day, but no more than for 60 days, in total, 420 rubles annually. Children who accompanied their parents exchanged 50 percent of the adult norm (to all Council for Mutual Economic

Assistance (CMEA) nations) or 25 percent (to capitalist nations). Private persons who traveled in their own car to socialist countries could exchange an additional 100 rubles to purchase fuel.

Persons who traveled on a business trip to socialist countries (except for Poland and Czechoslovakia) could exchange up to 500 rubles and take along three ten-ruble notes. Business travelers exchanged 200 rubles for Poland and 100 for Czechoslovakia. The same exchange norms were also set for tourists. If children traveled along with their parents on a tourist trip, then they received 50 percent of the adult norm; if without their parents, only 30 rubles were exchanged for children.

[PJ] When do the new exchange regulations take effect, and what kind of foundation do they have?

[Vishn'akov] The telegram, which was signed by Chairman of the Board Y. Moskovskiy of the USSR External Economic Activity Bank, was sent on 1 April, but we received it on 3 April at 10:30. With this moment the changes were in effect.

[PJ] And what are the main changes?

[Vishn'akov] Private persons who visit socialist countries (excluding Czechoslovakia) by invitation now can exchange 470 rubles each year, and, as until now, can take along the already mentioned 30 rubles. For those who travel to Czechoslovakia, the yearly exchange norm is 220 rubles, and 30 can be brought along. Children who accompany their parents may still exchange half of their parents' defined norm. Persons who wish to drive a personal car can no longer exchange 100 rubles for fuel.

Private persons who travel by invitation to capitalist nations, as well as to Yugoslavia and China, may now exchange only 200 rubles per year. Children may not even exchange money. If, because of some consideration, people have exchanged only half of the sum in place of the permitted 420 rubles, they can no longer exchange the other half.

Persons who travel for business or tourism purposes to socialist countries (excluding Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Mongolia, Vietnam and Cuba) can exchange 470 rubles. Travelers to Poland, Vietnam, Mongolia and Rumania can now exchange 270 rubles; to Czechoslovakia, 70; and to Cuba, 120 rubles. To all CMEA countries, one can bring 30 rubles in ten-ruble banknotes.

[PJ] The new regulations have just taken effect, but already "fresher" rumors have been heard: supposedly, as of 1 July, private persons who travel to capitalist countries will be able to exchange only 30 rubles.

[Vishn'akov] Such news is not at my disposal. I think that the current limits have been accepted only for a while, and soon they will be revoked again.

[PJ] Have the currency exchange regulations changed for people who emigrate to take up permanent residence in other countries?

[Vishn'akov] No. Each person (including children) who emigrates to live in any of the capitalist countries can exchange 90 rubles at the bank. When emigrating to socialist countries, there are no limits on currency exchange.

It is possible that I am mistaken, but, although I really want to, I cannot join in this optimism. It seems as if the crack that had appeared for a moment in the curtains has again been skillfully covered. This time, with the inferior Soviet ruble.

Rationale of New Constitution Proposed

18001111 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
14 Apr 89 p 3

[Article by Candidate of Legal Sciences R. Stanislovaytis "Why We Need a New Constitution"]

[Text] The struggle for human rights and the recognition of the individual's status as citizen has a history of many centuries. It has simultaneously been a struggle for a constitution. In meaning and significance a constitution bears witness to the essence and nature of the sociopolitical system and the aspirations and desires of certain social-class strata and the people as a whole. Therefore, a legal document establishing a certain social and legal system and expressing its conceptual nature and sociopolitical meaning has been given the name of basic law. A constitution includes the society's moral and political, socioeconomic, political-legal and cognitive principles and defines the direction of the creative activity of the human being as a whole. That is the case because the constitution gives legal expression to the most fundamental and deepest interests of people who make up a specific ethnic and cultural, socioeconomic, demographic and political-legal community. The ancient Romans defined this specific state of a community by four features: *lex naturale* (natural law), *lex imperium* (the law of the regime), *lex dominum* (the law of the territory), and *jus gentium* (the law of the people).

Over the course of many millennia these postulates were established on behalf of the powerful of this world. They are evident even today. Many peoples have to demonstrate their right to independence and right to a place under the sun regardless of, and sometimes despite, someone else's will.

In the person of the enlightenment philosophers, the nascent bourgeoisie created, for the first time in the world, an integral doctrine of popular sovereignty and the legal principles for its realization. The sovereignty of the people proclaimed by the revolutionary bourgeoisie was legally codified as:

- a system and procedures for the organization and activities of bodies of state authority and administration;
- a national-territorial system expressing the principles of the administration and self-government of territorial units;
- an economic system and principles of ownership;
- the rights and duties of citizens: the status of citizenship;
- symbols: a flag, an emblem and an anthem as the expression of the integral ethnocultural uniqueness of the people populating a certain territory.

In this process a mechanism was defined for the protection of citizens' proclaimed rights and liberties, as well for the protection as of the constitution itself and the constitutional system.

One such guarantee was the principle of the separation of powers—the independence of the legislative, judicial and executive authorities along with the indisputable supremacy of the law, constitutional principles, and the constitution as a whole. In this connection, constitutional courts arose as a special body for the protection of the basic law. Such courts guarantee the equality of all before the law and ensure the constituent's rights—equal, direct and secret elections, the right to recall elected officials, the struggle against special privileges, etc. In this connection the procedures and political-legal institutions monitoring the activities of the authorities are strictly regulated. They include a bicameral system of parliaments, specific terms of office, various parliamentary committees and commissions, political parties, and nonpolitical social-class organizations: trade unions, organizations of women, teachers, scientists, etc.

The invariable requirement of the activities of each and every organization and institution is that they are required to operate on the basis of the constitution and not contrary to it. Since the development of democracy as an aggregate system of social and political institutions expressing political power is not without contradictions and sharp clashes among various interests, their content depends on compromises concluded between opposing sides. Such solutions have often been reached through cruel bloodshed, social revolutions, and strikes. In a civilized society compromises are more often worked out at the negotiating table, when reason gains the upper hand.

The struggle for a constitution and constitutional regulation has brought out two opposite tendencies. The first signifies the development of constitutional principles as an essential condition of democracy. The second reveals a desire to reduce constitutional principles to naught, leaving for them the role of a convenient cover for an antidemocratic regime. The latter tendency is always distinguished by political demagoguery, empty verbiage,

a special ideologization, and a minimum of actual deeds. Various machinations, corruption, obedience to rank, etc. flourish on its basis. Both of these tendencies are characteristic of all political structures without exception, and they derive from the level of the population's cultural and moral and political development. The USSR has not escaped these tendencies.

The development of Russia at the beginning of the 20th century was distinguished by the feature that, along with the upsurge of the revolutionary democratic movement, a national liberation movement that was undermining the foundations of the empire gained strength in the country. The latter was opposed by the forces striving to preserve the new Russia within its former borders. This urge toward centralism also manifested itself very vigorously in the party of Bolshevism and in its program on the nationalities question.

Long before the October Revolution a bitter debate was waged over the principle of the self-determination of nations. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin demanded its categorical application in political practice and believed that self-determination, up to and including separation, was the inalienable right of sovereign nations. He stressed that it was mandatory that the union of nations belonging to a socialist federation be voluntary. But against the background of slogans calling for world revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the unity of nations in the struggle for the interests of the working class, many people understood and accepted the principle of self-determination, too, merely as a democratic slogan. A substantial number of Communists believed that its implementation would signify a betrayal of the interests of the proletariat of small nations and nationalities and express the interests only of the bourgeoisie.

V. I. Lenin especially clearly saw and revealed the danger of resolving the nationalities question by force at the time that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was established. At that time Vladimir Ilyich was already seriously ill, but on 30 and 31 December 1922 he dictated his famous work "On the Question of Nationalities, or of 'Autonomization.'" In it he warned that "freedom of secession from the union" might turn out to be an "empty piece of paper," and he spoke of the need to protect people of other nationalities from the "onslaught of that truly Russian man, the Great Russian chauvinist, essentially a scoundrel and an aggressor, which is what the typical Russian bureaucrat is." But in Lenin's estimation, the protective measures had not been adopted. And in that he perceptively saw the fateful role of Stalin, his "administrator's enthusiasm," and his "embitterment against notorious 'social nationalism.'" And here is Vladimir Ilyich's main conclusion. He envisaged the possibility of turning back as late as at the next Congress of Soviets, "that is, of leaving the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in existence only in military and diplomatic respects, and in all other respects restoring full independence...." Lenin saw rejection of the voluntary and equal nature of the union as a recurrence of imperialism.

Vladimir Ilyich's cruel illness and isolation from political life, which Stalin unswervingly conducted, did not permit the party to utilize Lenin's advice and demands. Subsequently the ideological basis of the whole development of the state became Stalin's version of Lenin, which gave rise to the rigid, maximally centralized, administrative-command system.

The reevaluation of Soviet reality that started with the 20th CPSU Congress was halted by the long period of stagnation and the subsequent process of the devaluation of morality and general culture, the formation of science supported by special funds, and the political disorientation of the population. The 19th All-Union Party Conference began the search for ways out of the existing situation, not just in the economy but in national-state construction, internationality relations, and the functioning of the country's political system. Before the party conference a heated debate got started on the question of the essence of the socialist federation, the subjects of the federation, and the inevitability of revising the existing USSR Constitution as incompatible with the principles of federalism and, to all intents and purposes, establishing a unitary system. Two schools of thought manifested themselves in the debate. The first proposed rejecting the Constitution as a whole and taking advantage of the experience of the world community of nations in state construction, giving special consideration to the experience of the other socialist countries, and fully restoring V. I. Lenin's final behests concerning the restructuring of the socialist federation and state apparatus. The second school of thought has been applied in amendments to the existing USSR Constitution, which has aroused a stormy protest, and not just in our republic.

It is these conceptual positions regarding the improvement, rather than the revision, of the Constitution that have accelerated the process of differentiation in scholarly circles. A certain number of legal scholars who previously refrained from expressing their own positions now quite frequently demand the repeal of the existing USSR Constitution as one that intensifies unitarianism, and the revision of the contract on the establishment of the USSR on a new basis, whereby the union republic is the sovereign subject of the federation. The jurisdiction of the USSR would be possible only as a mixed jurisdiction derived from the union republics. This is the concept that was applied in the draft Lithuanian SSR Constitution that was published. However, since the review of the draft by representatives of the second school, whose ideologist is Prof B. M. Lazarev, the draft itself has been rather spoiled. It can be considered a compromise draft with a view to further practical steps aimed at the realization of a new concept of the unique unification of equal union states.

It is gratifying to note that as of today there are more supporters of our original draft Constitution "in the strong center" than there were several months ago. Thus, Prof D. L. Zlatopolskiy, a theoretician of the Soviet federation, declares outright that Lenin's principles of

federation are not embodied in the present USSR Constitution, and that the formula that the USSR is "a unified union multinational state" is incorrect and unacceptable. However, in the published draft Constitution the republic did not reserve for itself all guarantees that its sovereignty would be realized. One essential guarantee of its sovereignty is the right to veto decisions adopted by union agencies within the limits of the authority delegated to them by the republics. It is necessary to provide for the right of oversight, through a constitutional oversight committee, over the activities of all the officials of federal agencies, and to provide new procedures for the formation of bodies of state authority and administration both in the center and in the republics.

Cosmopolitan universalism in state construction and in internationality relations must be resolutely rejected. The Constitution should become a firm basis not just for the functioning of the bodies of state authority and administration, but of the entire socialist political system, which expresses humanistic goals and people's aspirations. Therefore, the adoption of a Constitution should not be hurried. It should clearly reflect the foundation of society and serve as a firm legal guarantee for the activity of the country's citizens for the long-range future; it should be a stable foundation legal document—the basic law. Such a thing can be achieved only when all political-legal institutions are thoroughly thought out and are internally logically flawless and complete. The publication of the draft Constitution is remarkable for the fact that, like a spring icebreaker, it is feeling out the way not only for us but for other republics, as well, the way to the restructuring of our own and all-union state and legal life.

Despite certain compromises, the published draft Constitution represents a serious step forward. It begins the formation of relations of a new type among the union states. It clearly expresses the position that the constitutions of the union republics should be adopted first, and only on their basis should the union contract that serves as the constitutional basis of the federation be adopted. It recognizes the supremacy of republic law over all-union law, and it establishes the basis for relations among the union republics through the regularization of ownership relations, the formation of budgets, and the exercise of their sovereign rights in accordance with the principles of parity. It is also important that the draft codifies new principles of the economic and political system, and the basic principles for the development of culture and education. It erects fundamental obstacles to diktat by the center.

The implementation of the constitutional bases of the activities of the state apparatus will force many central departments simply to disappear, to eliminate themselves as absolutely useless. The first step toward that has already been taken—the USSR State Agroindustrial Committee has been eliminated. Other departments will

acquire the functions of coordinating agencies in inter-republic and international relations and will start to exercise arbitration powers of a sort. They are the ones that should be responsible, as the draft proposes, for the implementation of agreed-upon all-union programs on the basis of the republics' budgetary contributions for their implementation. On the whole, in my opinion, the draft differs favorably from the existing Constitution in its treatment of all the fundamental aspects of state political activity.

The creation of our republic's new Constitution has just been begun and is far from completion. Every new idea for improving the published draft can become very useful. But one must always remember that the constitution cannot be a normative act that regulates all our actions and endeavors in detail. It is only the basic law, that is, the law that establishes the unshakable and cherished foundations of society's political life.

Presidium of LiSSR Supreme Soviet Meets

18001124 Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
23 Apr 89 pp 1, 3

[Unattributed report: "In the Presidium of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] A session of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet was held on 21 April. This session was conducted by Vitautas Astrauskas, chairman of the Presidium of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet. Algirdas Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian CP Central Committee, took part in the session. Discussed herein was the activity of the Rokishkskiy Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies with regard to strengthening law and order. It was noted that crime has not been reduced in this rayon and that, within the structure of crimes, there is an increase in serious crimes. This has been greatly influenced by the spread of drunkenness and by the weakening of the work done by the people's guards, as well as that of the comrades' courts, public centers for maintaining order, and other public formations; less attention is being accorded to teaching people about the law. Home brewing has become widespread in almost all the districts of this rayon. Twenty-two persons were poisoned last year from home-made alcohol. Labor collectives have not been strict enough with drunken drivers and machine-operators, of whom more than 500 were arrested from behind the wheel just last year. Among such abusers of alcohol are quite a few responsible employees of enterprises and farms. Drunkenness has become widespread even during working time. More and more crimes are being committed by minors, but preventive measures to avert them have slackened.

The Presidium obligated the Rokishkskiy Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies and its ispolkom to be more active in coordinating the efforts of the law-and-order organs, labor collectives, and self-help organizations to strengthen law and order. Better use should be made of

the powers belonging to the Soviet's permanent commissions, as well as the commissions for inspections, juvenile affairs, and administrative commissions. It is particularly important to discover the causes of crimes, to form within the labor collectives an attitude of intolerance toward violations of the law.

Taking into account the wishes of the public, the Presidium assigned to this republic's law-enforcement organs the task of preparing proposals for tightening up the responsibility for home-brewing, speculation, and the failure to observe traffic-safety regulations.

This session discussed the work of the local Soviet of People's Deputies and their organs on rendering aid to the election commissions and on ensuring the execution of the Law on Elections of the USSR People's Deputies. It was emphasized that elections were being conducted in a new way, under conditions of glasnost and democracy.

However, not all phases of the election campaign managed to avoid trouble, and sometimes even violations of the Law on Elections. The ispolkoms have insufficiently aided the district-level election commissions in drawing up the lists of voters. Therefore, such lists had certain inaccuracies, which entailed justifiable complaints. A considerable portion of the inhabitants did not know the knew balloting procedure; therefore, more than 100,000 ballots were deemed invalid. Because of violations of the Election Law, the results of balloting in five election precincts were declared null and void.

At meetings with the voters the deputies were given quite a few varied instructions. The Presidium entrusted the LiSSR Council of Ministers with the task of outlining specific actions for carrying out the voters' wishes. At the same time the local organs of authority are obligated to discuss those proposals by voters which fall within their fields of competence and to implement them immediately.

Since the course of the elections also revealed certain shortcomings in the election system, it was decided to prepare proposals for improving the Law on the Elections of USSR People's Deputies. The working group which was set up under the Presidium of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet on problems of improving constitutional laws and enhancing the role to be played by the Soviets of People's Deputies recommended speeding up the preparation of draft republic-level election laws and presenting them before the end of May.

At the session a thorough analysis was conducted of the progress being made by the draft of the LiSSR Constitution. It was noted that labor groups, public organizations and movements, as well as the population are analyzing the draft with an interested motivation and are introducing quite a few proposals and remarks. Approximately 900 have been received by the Presidium of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet alone. Most of all, the discussions are

being conducted on those sections of the draft which approve and ratify the political and economic system, as well as the social development and culture of this republic. It is proposed that the status of the Lithuanian Communist Party be made more precise. A general desire was expressed to create national military formations in which Lithuania's young people would serve. Quite a few notes have been received regarding the need to more precisely formulate the contents of LiSSR citizenship and the procedure for granting it. Various proposals have come in regarding the articles defining the republic's exclusive property, regulating the operation of the Union-level laws, as well as the elections system.

All the remarks and proposals which have come in are analyzed and summarized. The Presidium of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet has proposed that the local Soviets of People's Deputies and their ispolkoms activate discussion of the draft in labor collectives, as well as in state and public organizations, and that it more extensively involve jurists and specialists from other fields. It is important to achieve a situation whereby all inhabitants of the republic participate in the preparation of the new Constitution. The LiSSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, along with newspaper and journal editors, have been assigned the task of more actively explaining and propagandizing the positions made in the draft, especially revealing its social, political, and legal thrust.

At the Presidium session a decree was adopted by means of which the Planning-and-Budget Commission of the Supreme Soviet, as well as the permanent sectorial commissions were assigned the task of conducting a preliminary analysis of the Draft State Plan for the economic and Social Development of the LiSSR's Budget for the year 1990, as well as the execution of the present year's plan and budget. In contrast to previous practice, the permanent commissions this year will begin to analyze the plan and the budget considerably earlier. The deputies will be able to penetrate more deeply into all the indicators of the drafts being prepared, into their grounds and reality, whereas the commissions will be able to prepare specific and businesslike conclusions. Ministers, chairmen of state committees, and leading officials of departments has been charged with the duty of presenting multifaceted information and of rendering other practical assistance.

The Presidium approved the publicly elected Council for Safeguarding Lithuania's Cultural Heritage and decided to consider it operative under the Presidium of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet; it also discussed its statutes. The goal of this council's activity is to intensify the public's influence on the safeguarding and restoration of the republic's cultural landmarks and on their appropriate utilization.

In recent times there have been more frequent instances whereby criminal groups or individuals, by threatening to use violence, demand that state, public, or personal

property be turned over to them (rackets). In order to prevent such crimes, a new edition of Articles 96 and 150 of the LiSSR Criminal Code has been issued. According to the new law, extortion of property (rackets), taking into account the damage caused and other criteria, can entail incarceration for up to 10 years, as well as confiscation of property.

By an Ukase of the Presidium, changes were made in the second part of Article 34 of the LiSSR Housing Code. The new edition provides that if a citizen dies or moves to another permanent place of residence, and if he was scheduled for an improvement of his housing conditions, a member of his family shall take his place provided that there are grounds for improving his housing conditions. At the same time, it is pointed out that, at his place of employment, a family member is to be placed on the schedule only if he has been employed at the same enterprise, institution, or organization.

Taking into account the wishes and proposals of the public, it was decided to create a Commission on the Affairs of Military Service by Young People, such a commission to be under the jurisdiction of the Presidium of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet. This commission, which will include deputies and representatives of various public organizations, will observe the call-up of young persons into the army, be interested in the conditions of their service, analyze the non-regulation relations, and maintain ties with the military units and the parents of the youths. The composition of this commission will be announced.

The session also discussed the issues of making awards, granting pardons, and other matters of state and public life.

Family Insurance Coverage Amended

*18001014a Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
29 Apr 89 p 3*

[Interview with Lithuanian SSR Main State Insurance Administration Chief Y. Berzhinskis by M. Dauenayte: "Personal Insurance Terms Improved"; date and place of interview not given]

[Text] The terms of insurance for citizens were noticeably updated in April of this year. Y. Berzhinskis, chief of the Lithuanian SSR Main Administration of State Insurance, describes the changes to journalist M. Correspondent.

[Correspondent] Why was it necessary to introduce changes into the terms of personal insurance?

[Berzhinskis] In order to more fully satisfy the needs and interests of the citizens. It was with regard for their wishes that many restrictions associated with drawing up personal insurance policies were abolished, the order of payment of insurance claims was changed, and the range of cases in which such claims are paid was expanded.

[Correspondent] What has changed, for example, in the practice of signing policies?

[Berzhinskis] While until recent times an individual could insure only himself and his children, a husband, a wife and parents can now be insured as well. Combined life insurance policies can now be taken out with them as beneficiaries, and relatives may be insured against accidents. As we know, personal insurance policies could not be signed by persons in disability groups I and II before. Now most of these persons (unemployed group I disabled persons are an exception) can be insured against accidents, they can take out combined life insurance policies, and they can insure children and grandchildren.

[Correspondent] You mentioned renewal of the range of cases in which insurance claims would be paid.

[Berzhinskis] Yes, this is an extremely important change. It has affected, as an example, the terms of combined auto insurance, known as "avto-kombi" [transliteration], and insurance of the driver and baggage. While insurance claims were paid previously only after the death of the policyholder or driver, now they are also paid (in amounts of 300, 500 or 800 rubles) in cases in which a motor vehicle accident causes group I, II or III disability respectively.

When he takes out a policy, the individual naturally thinks not only of himself. He is also concerned that in the event that he suffers a misfortune, his children or other loved ones would not be left without material support. This is why all personal insurance policies now guarantee that in the event of a tragedy, the person indicated by the insurer or his legal heirs would receive the entire insurance payment foreseen by the policy.

The new terms of insurance also foresee cases in which, for example, a person who has taken out a policy on a child until he comes of age and marries suddenly dies, and payments on the insurance policy cease. Despite this, the policy is not cancelled. Children and grandchildren remain insured against accidents until they reach an age of 17-18 years. After they create their own families or attain an age of 21 years, they receive the amounts foreseen by the policies.

Before, following the death of the insurer the insurance premiums were never paid back to anyone if the insured suffered diseases of the central nervous system, tuberculosis, cirrhosis of the liver and other ailments indicated in a special list, and died because of them in the first years of insurance coverage. These restrictions have now been removed. Under the new terms, cases in which the insured is declared to be missing are also accounted for under the new terms. Insurance payments are now made to the policy's beneficiaries or to the heirs of the missing person.

At the same time expansion of the list of cases in which benefits would be paid on the basis of insurance policies has not had an effect on restrictions associated with the fight against drunkenness and crime. As before, insurance benefits will not be paid if the policyholder was injured or died while committing a crime or while operating a motor vehicle intoxicated.

[Correspondent] What can you say about changes concerning supplementary pension insurance?

[Berzhinskis] Introduction of voluntary supplementary pension insurance has by itself elicited considerable interest among the people, since this practice allows many to tangibly supplement their state pensions. Citizens have started expressing many wishes and suggestions on this account. It was with regard for public opinion that the terms of pension insurance were amended. Permission has now been granted to both younger people and the more elderly to take out the appropriate policies.

While in former times women could take out such policies at ages from 30 to 55 years and men could do so from 35 to 60, women can now take out such policies at ages from 20 to 60 years, and men can do so from 25 to 65. The longer the period of insurance, the lower the monthly premium. For example a 40 year old woman who has taken out insurance on a supplementary pension of 50 rubles pays a monthly insurance premium of 21 rubles 90 kopecks until 55 years old, while a 20 year old woman who has taken out insurance for the same supplementary pension pays a monthly premium of just 4 rubles 90 kopecks. The "shortfall" of money is covered in such cases by the state budget. Thus the state has made old-age insurance more accessible to the people. It is important to keep in mind in this case that while in former times only employed individuals could take out supplementary pension insurance policies, now an exception has been made in regard to women raising two or more children up to 16 years old who are not working for this reason.

The following question naturally arises: Because supplementary pension insurance is designed to cover a rather lengthy period of time, who receives the amount paid into the policy if the person does not live to retirement age? Before, the money was paid to the spouse, or to the heirs in the absence of the latter. It is now foreseen that when drawing up the insurance policy or at some later date, the policyholder could himself determine who is to receive the amount paid on the policy or the supplementary pension for a period of 7 years.

[Correspondent] Citizens sometimes complain in their letters (including to press organs) that they have to wait a long time for claims to be paid on personal insurance policies due to all kinds of formalities.

[Berzhinskis] Such letters will now be either a thing of the past, or almost so. Here is why. Incapacitation is no longer a mandatory requirement for payment of insurance claims. Payments are now made simply in connection with a specific injury loss.

Assume for example that an insured person goes to a hospital due to an injury. The doctor that provides him medical care issues the necessary certificate to be submitted to the state insurance inspection office. Our organs pay the insurance claim without delay, as soon as they receive the victim's claim and that certificate. The health of the insured will now be rechecked only in exceptional cases. Let me turn the attention of all citizens to the fact that if the inspection office receives all of the necessary documents and fails to pay the insurance claim within 7 days, it will have to pay the client a penalty for every extra day.

I think that the changes that have been introduced into insurance affairs will have a favorable effect on the budget of almost every family. After all, each family in the republic carries an average of two or three insurance policies! As a result of the measures discussed above, state insurance will make a worthy contribution to improving social security and increasing the public welfare.

Joint Enterprise Products Exhibited

18001014b Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian
29 Apr 89 p 3

[Article by A. Pipiras: "Baltic Amadeus: The Ties Grow Stronger"]

[Text] A three-day commercial seminar organized by the Soviet-Austrian joint venture "Baltic Amadeus" ended in Palanga on 28 April. A sales exhibition of the latest models of the enterprise's products—personal computers, peripheral devices and software—ran concurrently here. Specialists from various enterprises and from the country's organizations had an opportunity to acquaint themselves with permanent and mobile electronic instruments of various capacities.

"We were attracted by the high quality of the enterprise's products, their outstanding esthetic appearance, the good possibilities for their practical use, and the guaranteed technical maintenance," said V. Ponomarev, assistant chief surgeon of the medical-sanitary service of Kaliningrad's production association of fish industry. "We signed a contract for several personal computers without hesitation. We hope to use them to automate dispensary treatment of fishermen and workers of shore services, statistical accounting and other work that doctors have to do."

The enterprise's computers, which are capable of carrying out from 200,000 to 2 million operations per second, also received a favorable assessment from other visitors to the exhibition.

"The seminar has made us optimistic," said the enterprise's general director Yu. Zalatoryus. "We signed several mutually profitable contracts in Palanga. But most importantly, we have been able to reach basic agreement to set up branch offices for the enterprise in different regions of the country."

"Soviet specialists have displayed considerable interest in the equipment presented in the exhibition," confirmed Albert Valtner, the enterprise's first assistant general director. "Now we can take a new bold step forward—this year we can start assembling computers in Vilnius."

Reader Asserts Children Lack Opportunities to Learn Ukrainian

18110063a Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian
28 Jan 89 p 2

[Reader letter, published under the rubric "Readers' Mail Speaking Frankly," by V. Didenko: "I Am for Bilingualism"]

[Text] Good day to you! I have never written a letter to a newspaper before, but my attention was drawn by an interesting article in your 22 December 1988 issue entitled "Speaking Frankly." A little bit about myself. I am a miner, 34 years of age, employed as a mine foreman at the Stakhanovugol Production Association Mine imeni Ilich. My interest was drawn to the article because your correspondents were not far from our town of Stakhanov. I, as one of your readers, would like to say the following. The main reason why people do not wish to subscribe to your paper is the language barrier. All my kin and that of my wife speak Ukrainian, but our children—our nine-year-old daughter and three-year-old son—do not know Ukrainian.

Instruction at school is in Russian, and the same applies to kindergarten. The children spend little time with us—both my wife and I work. On Ukrainian Television only the decorative titles are written in our language. Even the cartoons are only in Russian on the kiddie cartoon show "Katrusya's Movie House." And, take note of this, when a Ukrainian Television interviewer addresses some party committee secretary in Ukrainian, the latter always replies in Russian. Your correspondents as well have turned for the most part to those who in fact disdain our language. Where is this vaunted bilingualism?

Academician on Eliminating Blank Spots in Ukrainian Economics

18110063b Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA in
Ukrainian 3 Feb 89 p 2

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences P. Leonenko, docent, Kiev State University Department of Political Economy: "Time to Repay Debts: Concerning V. Sikora's Article 'Alone With Oneself, or Lost Opportunities of Our Economic Science'"]

[Text] The 14 January 1989 issue of RADYANSKA UKRAYINA contained polemical comments on a topic of current relevance by Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Sikora, entitled "Alone With Oneself, or the Lost Opportunities of Our Economic Science." I would like to share some of my thoughts on the problems addressed by the author.

In my opinion there are no grounds for objection to V. Sikora's theses on the importance and necessity of constructive study of the development of non-Marxian—including bourgeois—thought, reexamination of "blank spots" in Ukrainian economic science, etc. I am also fully in agreement with those critical assessments which the author makes of the state of study of non-Marxian economic ideas in the Ukraine. The warning by the author of these polemical comments about the need for a radical reassessment of many items on the history of economic thought published during the period of stagnation is absolutely valid. At the same time I feel that V. Sidora has somewhat narrowed the problem of the lost opportunities of Soviet economic science. This was manifested, in the first place, in examination only of academy of sciences economic thinking (while the overwhelming majority of economists work at higher educational institutions); secondly, in primary emphasis on the task of working on so-called "blank spots" in Ukrainian economic science, of course, taking into account the achievements of world socioeconomic thought.

The unsatisfactory situation in the field of research on the history of economic teachings, especially Ukrainian thought, is well known not only to us but to our ideological adversaries abroad as well. A group-authorship monograph entitled "Selected Contributions by Ukrainian Scholars to Economic Theory" was published in the West in 1984. Unfortunately, it was ignored by Soviet scholars. Its editor, I. Koropetsky, described rather accurately certain shortcomings of contemporary research on the history of economic thought in the Ukraine and provided a well-substantiated argument opposing the almost total isolation of Ukrainian research from the development of world science. At the same time, one should clearly state the monograph's ideological function (a task, which, incidentally, Soviet scholars should definitely perform in a constructive study of development of non-Marxian economic science). It is revealed first and foremost in presentation of the specific reasons for the deficiencies and ways to correct them. I.

Koropetsky sees the reason for the unsatisfactory state of affairs in the field of historical-economic research not in defects in the professional training of the researchers or in organization of scientific research work (as might seem at first glance), but allegedly in "deliberate efforts on the part of the Soviet central authorities to reduce the Ukraine to the status of an intellectual and scientific provincial backwater." Such an "explanation" clearly pursues a political aim of kindling interethnic conflict and is without substance.

One also notes another significant element. Bourgeois economists devote considerable attention to the study of the views of such conflictive figures in the history of economic thought as M. I. Tuhon-Baranovsky, H. M. Tsekhanovetsky, R. Rozdolsky, and others. With this they provide additional fodder to the claim by bourgeois scholars to preeminence in evaluation of the theory legacy of those Soviet economists who split with Marxism due to their class position and whose contribution to scholarship has to date not been adequately analyzed in our economics literature. Therefore, attempts to stew in one's own kettle for an extended period of time in actuality constitute not only lost opportunities for our economic science but also lead to the appearance of "critical points" in the debate with the representatives of contemporary Western economic thought.

It follows from the polemical notes that their author is counting on the wisdom of the administrative officials of the UkSSR Academy of Sciences Department of Economics and the academy institutes. Indeed, elaboration and implementation of specific measures to transform historical-economic research into a priority area of development of the social sciences would signify a change in the existing state of affairs for the better. I shall note in turn that up to the present time the Ukrainian Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education lacks a strategy and tactics aimed at stimulating development of historical-economic research and improvement in the training of personnel in this field of endeavor. In my opinion the following facts can attest most clearly to the consequences to which this is leading. **Not one Ukrainian higher educational institution has a department of history of the economy and economic thought. At the economics higher educational institutions in this republic courses on history of economics either are not offered or at best are offered at certain institutes in truncated, predigested form. Not one scientific paper has been written on synthesis of development of economic science in this country or this republic in the last quarter of a century, nor has any textbook dealing with history of economics been published. According to the figures from a sociological survey conducted at Ukrainian higher educational institutions in 1987-1988, only three (!) percent of social scientists used foreign-language sources in their work. Therefore, those specific areas in which work should be done in order radically to restructure historical-economics research and teaching of appropriate academic courses are clearly apparent.**

Initially, consolidation of the efforts of university scientists would, in my opinion, be fostered by organization of and work by interdepartmental scientific-problem groups in the historical-economic sciences. And in the future, it is essential to establish at economics higher educational institutions and in the economics departments of this republic's universities base departments of history of the economy and economic thought, as well as the introduction of a major study dealing with this problem area.

It is high time to repay debts, to utilize fully the favorable opportunities opened up for economists by perestroika. Obviously, one cannot expect fantastic, immediate success, in view of the overall state of affairs in the area of research and teaching of the historical-economic sciences. But there are no grounds for pessimism either, for society is ready for a radical change in this state of affairs.

3024

Newspaperman Asserts Moldavian Culture Better Attended to Than Ukrainian

18110057a Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA in
Ukrainian 24 Jan 89 p 1

[Article by I. Herman, executive secretary, rayon newspaper NOVYY PUT, Moldavian SSR: "Song Unites Us"]

[Text] The Soviet Union is a federation. Each of the union republics is also a kind of federation since, in addition to the primary indigenous population, members of other peoples also reside in each of these republics, often in fairly large numbers. Frequently, by virtue of certain conditions, they do not have their own ethnic formation within the framework of the union republic. I reside in one such "federation," on Moldavian soil. This region has been dear to me since childhood. I have respect and esteem for the Moldavians, and I know the Moldavian language fairly well, although I am a Ukrainian by nationality. And there are more than half a million persons like me in Soviet Moldavia. This is a large ethnic grouping for such a small republic.

The displacement of peoples (this may not be a scientific term, but I believe that it fairly accurately reflects reality) is a historical process. This process has also touched Moldavia. According to the 1979 population census, ethnic representation among the population of the Moldavian SSR was as follows: 63.9 percent Moldavian; 14.2 percent Ukrainian; 12.8 percent Russian; 3.5 percent Gagauz; 2 percent Bulgarian. These are the largest ethnic groups. Germans, Greeks, Jews, and members of other ethnic minorities also reside in Moldavia. I should stress, and this is very important, that all the peoples which reside in the Moldavian SSR, including the Ukrainians, live harmoniously with the Moldavians, as a unified

family, and that is the way it should be, both today and in the future. But relations between peoples should, in my opinion, improve on the basis of genuine equality and justice.

The Ukrainians in Moldavia are not recent arrivals. I am no historian and shall not delve into the depths of time, although that is where the roots of the present-day Ukrainian people are to be found. In the 17th-18th centuries, maltreated peasants, leaving their homeland forever, fled to unoccupied land along the Dniester, Prut and Danube rivers.

The Ukrainian refugee in Moldavia was made to feel right at home, with the Ukrainian frequently adopting a local family name. The Ukrainians also responded to the Moldavians with kindness. Harmony, friendship, and brotherhood were always the measure of interrelationships between the two peoples.

Generation upon generation of Ukrainians have been born on this fertile land, growing up, living and working together with the Moldavians and other peoples, enhancing this region with the fruits of their toil. We have everything. In my opinion, only one thing could be better—our spiritual and intellectual life. We do a poor job of teaching our children our native language and literature.

Our children study history of the Ukrainian SSR as a part, as an individual subsection of history of the USSR. Under these circumstances can they learn very much about the glorious past of the Ukrainian people? And what about literature? I remember after the war I learned the works of Taras Shevchenko with just two of his poems: "Testament" and "The Dream." Both then and now Ukrainians learn Ukrainian literature, including Shevchenko, in Russian translation. And such outstanding literary figures as I. Kotlyarevskyy, H. Kvitka-Onovyanenko, I. Nechuy-Levytskyy, I. Karpenko-Karyy, P. Myrnyy, Iv. Franko, M. Kotsyubynskyy, and Lesya Ukrayinka are not even taught in the schools.

What about contemporary literature? What about the poetry of M. Rylskyy, P. Tychna, and V. Sosyura, the prose writings of A. Holovko, O. Dovzhenko, M. Stelmakh, and O. Honchar, the brilliant humor and biting satire of Ostap Vyshnya, and the plays of M. Kulish, I. Mykytenko, and O. Korniychuk? It is unlikely that one could even name them all!

Today it is very rare to hear Ukrainian songs, let alone folk songs, in Ukrainian villages. The older generations gradually die off without having passed on even a small part of that spiritual and intellectual wealth which they obtained from their forefathers. The young people sing neither the old songs which their parents and grandparents sang, nor the new ones.

It seems to me that the Moldavians residing in the Ukrainian SSR are better attended to. For example, Ukrainian republic radio has a Moldavian-language service. In villages with a Moldavian population there are schools at which instruction is given in Moldavian, and there is a publishing house which publishes textbooks for these schools. In Odessa Oblast there are Moldavian-language radio and TV broadcasts. There is also Moldavian-language broadcasting in Chernovtsy Oblast. In addition, Moldavian-language oblast and rayon newspapers are published in Bukovina, in particular the oblast newspaper ZORILE BUKOVINEY [Bukovina Morning Star]. There are also ensembles which give concerts of Moldavian music.

I recently learned that the Union of Writers of Moldavia has sent a letter to its colleagues in the Ukraine, containing an appeal to show proper care and concern to both Moldavian and Ukrainian villages, to help see that Ukrainian villages in Moldavia have Ukrainian-language schools, kindergartens, and books, and that Moldavian villages in the Ukraine have Moldavian-language schools, kindergartens, and books. Here we have a way out of the current situation, a road toward spiritual and intellectual growth, a road toward genuine, even stronger and more lasting friendship.

I am profoundly convinced and believe that people can and should live well. And to achieve this they must seek out that which unites them, not that which divides.

To seek and to find. Definitely to find. This is a hallmark of man. It is very important here that every individual feel that he is no different from everybody else. This is prescribed in one of the resolutions of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, entitled "On Interethnic Relations": "It is necessary to ensure that nationalities and ethnic groups which reside outside the boundaries of their own political-territorial formations or do not possess such territorial structures obtain more opportunities for achieving ethnic-cultural aspirations, particularly in the domain of education, communication, ethnic creative arts, as well as creation of centers of national and ethnic culture, utilization of the mass media, and satisfying of religious needs." This is a valid statement. It is necessary only that one work hard in this direction, and everything can be accomplished in the best possible manner.

3024

Reader Asks That Ukrainians in Other Parts of USSR Be Remembered

18110057b Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian 24 Jan 89 p 1

[Reader letter, published under the rubric "Readers Write Candidly," by V. Obodnyuk, Vinnitsa Oblast: "How Many of Us Are There?"]

[Text] I have visited Tselinograd Oblast in Kazakhstan. There are approximately 1 million Ukrainians living there. There are also many of our brothers in Ussuriysk

Oblast, in the Maritime Kray. Are you aware of this fact? Do you ever have contact with your readers in distant places? In my opinion they too should be taken into consideration. RADYANSKA UKRAYINA should reach readers residing beyond the boundaries of this republic. They are interested in knowing what is happening in our republic and how perestroika is proceeding. And perhaps readers within our republic would be interested in knowing how Ukrainians are doing in other regions.

Incidentally, do you know how many Ukrainians there are in the Soviet Union? How about in Europe? How about in the world? Why not write about this in your newspaper?

I would like you to pay greater attention to our native language and write about it.

I would think that you should report about life in the union republics, from the Kurils to the Carpathians, as they say. But how can you do this if you do not maintain correspondents in those areas? You should give some thought to how this can be accomplished.

I am aware of the separation of church and state in this country. But at the same time our Constitution guarantees freedom of conscience. Therefore, why are they not allowing a church to be opened in my native village of Sumivka, Bershadskiy Rayon, Vinnitsa Oblast?

And why not write about our village, which saw a great deal of suffering during the Civil War, in 1933, and during the years of Stalinist repression? People are waiting in anticipation....

3024

Ukrainian Readers Informed of Developments in Estonian Press

18110074 Kiev RADYANSKA UKRAYINA in Ukrainian 28 Feb 89 p 3

[Article, published under the rubric "At the Request of Our Readers," by V. Desyatnikov: "'Just One Wrong Move'...: From the Pages of the republic newspaper SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA"]

[Text] Unfortunately we know little about the events in the Baltic republics, and especially in Estonia. And yet they are instructive in many respects, and particularly from the standpoint of clarification of certain elements of the strategy and tactics of perestroika, the true, actual role of the newly-formed associations, societies, and groups and their complex, at times sharply conflictive interaction. Also important is a sober analysis of efforts to create a model of republic economic accountability: what is actually viable, and what has arisen on the crest of romantic notions which are far from harsh realities and now is an impedance, causing discord and dispute, failing to promote consolidation of healthy forces. All

these things fill the content of the major articles published in SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA. We shall therefore glance through issues covering the last several months and begin with that which has generated the most rumor and fiction.

Is it true that the Estonians have adopted restrictions on the sale of goods to visitors to the republic, that you, having arrived in Tallinn as a tourist, might as well not go into any stores, because they won't sell you anything? Our answer is as follows: on the whole, this is true. Here is what Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences Academician M. Bronshteyn says in an article entitled "How Can We Protect Our Market?" (16 February). After a brief discussion of the anxiety on the part of a certain segment of the population regarding the export of in-demand goods out of the republic, he states: "And therefore we are now employing extraordinary measures to protect our domestic market. We are prohibiting the sending of parcels and baggage containing short-supply foodstuffs and manufactured goods, and we are introducing the prohibition of sale of a long list of goods to 'foreigners'. The capital of our republic provides an example here as well. Without a document proving that you are a resident of Tallinn or Kharyuskiy Rayon, they will not sell you high-demand items." The author goes on: "While all of us are happy for our brothers and sisters in the capital, for some reason one wishes this was not being done. And now proposals are being made that goods be purchasable only upon presentation of an Estonian passport. And the most ardent defenders of the domestic market propose that enterprises be prohibited from exporting consumer goods (and perhaps other goods as well) out of the republic."

This academician is a sober-minded individual. He is well aware that the world trend is different. He knows (and tells about it) what the Common Market has given Europe. He discusses the new steps being taken to "eliminate" economic boundaries in Europe. The newspaper also informs its readers in passing reference that Estonia's neighbors are also employing countermeasures. In a neighboring oblast they will not sell gasoline to the driver of a car bearing an Estonian license plate, and in Leningrad they will not sell certain goods to an Estonian. Such things sadden one. Is this a preamble to republic economic accountability in the Estonian manner?

Issues of the newspaper in recent months attest to the extremely complex political situation in that republic. A large number of newly-formed organizations, groups, and societies are operating in Estonia, many of which are engaging in confrontation with one another, and sometimes are outright fighting. To date only verbal weapons have been put into play, but there have already been calls to real arms. This is confirmed, for example, in a major interview with one of the leading figures of the Estonian Popular Front, Kh. Valk, appearing in the 18 January issue. This article serves as a guide listing the social forces currently operating in that republic. What forces are we talking about? The Narodnyy Front [Popular

Front], Interdvizheniye [Intermovement], Estonskiy Khristianskiy Soyuz [Estonian Christian Union], Forum Nezavisimoy Molodezhi [Independent Youth Forum], Tallinskiy Nezavisimyy Otryad [Tallinn Independent Detachment], and Nezavisimoye Info [Independent Info]. There is also a National Independence Party [Partiya Natsional'noy Nezavisimosti]. How do Kh. Valk and the Popular Front in general feel about this party? He states: "It seems to me that you have to respect them for their courage (he is referring to party spokesmen advocating secession from the USSR), since quite recently all such statements (advocating secession—V. D.) have landed people in jail. This requires courage—to continue along this road, knowing that the same thing may happen as happened to the Karabakh Committee. We may be experiencing perestroika, but power is still in the hands of the bureaucracy."

A letter written by a Tallinn worker by the name of A. Shibin, entitled "From a Position of Common Sense," which appeared in the newspaper on 14 January, is indicative of the general political situation in the republic. What was the letter about? The author of the letter, enumerating absolutely concrete facts, exposed the political essence of a number of statements made by one of the leaders of the Popular Front, E. Savisaar. In particular, he exposed the latter's inflammatory speeches, to call a spade a spade, regarding the role of the Estonian Communist Party, the interaction of various newly-formed organizations, etc. This really set things off! One of the newspaper's correspondents, for example, argued in an extensive letter that A. Shibin could not possibly be a worker, since he was a person of considerable erudition, too well informed about specific problems, in the writer's opinion, and in particular knew too much about the events in Armenia. Although the author specifically added the statement "not a member of the Popular Front" to his signature, it was quite obvious what he represented. The fact is that this "not a member of the Front" found himself in an embarrassing situation, for it was confirmed that A. Shibin was indeed a worker, although he had a higher education, in fact possessing a candidate of sciences degree. He had lived and worked in Armenia, and therefore was quite familiar with what was happening there. Embarrassing? Yes indeed. But soon Popular Front spokesmen launched a frontal attack on Shibin. Various labels began to be thrown about. Shibin's letter, in which he openly and candidly expressed his views and based them on facts which nobody could refute, was declared to be an "informer's false denunciation" [donos]. A fine example of intelligent debate. Just reading it evokes sadness and shame.

One article on economics which appeared in SOVETSKAYA ESTONIYA ("That's the Way It Is," 18 January) contains a rather accurate description of certain aspects of the political situation in that republic. I should like to end my survey with this article. "The Estonian public, in spite of coinciding root interests, is becoming polarized before our eyes. Republic economic

accountability and the effort to expand economic autonomy have evoked a new outpouring of opposing proposals and appraisals. The most dangerous thing about them is the fact that demands which are morally justified but wholly acceptable only as final-stage solutions keep being presented as priority tasks. At the present time they are not only impracticable but also lead to an impasse of extremely dangerous confrontation and tension.

"The Estonian people are famed for the intelligent, unhurried hands of their master craftsmen. Regardless of what others do or say, they know that intricately precise work cannot be done with excessive force. One wrong move and the tool will shatter, and the work will be totally ruined."

Very well put.

3024 0

**ArSSR Council of Ministers Chairman
Markaryants on Priority Tasks**

18300469a Moscow PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK
in Russian No 4, Feb 89 p 5

[Interview with Armenian SSR Council of Ministers Chairman Vladimir Surenovich Markaryants conducted by TASS correspondents R. Karagezyan and V. Ponomarev especially for PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK]

[Text] Yerevan—Our interview kept being postponed. The chairman of the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers Vladimir Surenovich Markaryants had either gone to the disaster area, or to some remote villages, or to the factories... Finally, we agreed to meet on Sunday, for the head of the republic government it was no different from any other day of the week. His deputies and ministers also work... Let us begin the planned interview.

[Correspondent] Vladimir Surenovich, you are heading the republic's highest governmental office during difficult times...

[V. Markaryants] Yes, there is a great deal to get depressed about, but primarily that terrible legacy that restructuring has inherited in the republic. The village is in an extremely neglected state. Its development apparently stopped about 25 years ago. Judge for yourself: whereas someone living in Yerevan gets 750 liters of water a day, a villager does not even get 30. Only every fourth village has gas, and the sewage systems are inadequate everywhere. A direct reproach to the administrative offices is the fact that approximately 20 percent of the republic's able-bodied population is not employed in public production. This results in migration and departure from the republic in search of a living. It is as though people are temporary inhabitants in their native land.

What has caused the clashes between nationalities, the reduction in the standard of living, the lack of social and legal protection and other negative phenomena? The reasons are distortions in personnel policy, favoritism, protectionism and promotion based on personal devotion to incompetent people who compromise themselves. Abuse of one's official position, unpunished protection of criminal elements and corruption of parts of the administration machinery have become commonplace. This is all aggravated by the social and domestic disorder of the population, serious omissions in carrying out the plans of the national economy and disruption of the tasks concerning housing construction and the Food Program. The people who have been assigned to take decisive measures to combat this have been acting as though nothing in particular is happening.

Let's take Nagornyy Karabakh, for example. We argue from afar that we have great love for the Armenians who live there, but no one has gone there and asked: "How are you doing, brothers? What problems are troubling you?" For it was a well-known fact that this national region has accumulated a lot of problems, but they have not been seriously dealt with.

[Correspondent] What ways do you see for overcoming the crisis?

[V. Markaryants] There is only one answer: restructuring. Vigorous and dynamic. In all directions. There is no other way. Raising the towns and villages in the disaster area from the ruins, implementing a comprehensive program of development in the rural areas, communicating with neighbors, painstakingly and patiently, and untying the knots of friction between nationalities on a mutual basis. But this cannot be hacked at anyhow. We are considering creating joint commissions and representation and not allowing a single instance of aggravation of relations between nationalities to go unnoticed. People should return to the place their grandfathers lived, where they themselves were born. But they should not be forced to return, rather conditions should be created which will foster work and a vigorous life. Let us move branches of industrial enterprises to the neglected villages, and build complexes there for processing agricultural products so that people can also be employed in the winter. Let us build cultural centers and roads and organize communication networks and transportation. A competition has already been announced for the design of the best house for new settlers.

[Correspondent] Experience shows that the success of restructuring is primarily determined by competent, selfless and honest people.

[V. Markaryants] Recently, an open discussion took place in the Council of Ministers system. We tried to understand why the administrative mechanism was collapsing. In some places it has become a little rusty and in

others it is also morally worn out. There are omissions, disorganization and irresponsibility, and you often do not find out who the guilty ones are.

For example, at the Council of Ministers meeting it was unequivocally stated that not a single representative, be he of high or low standing, has the right to count on support from the republic government if he has not organized and fulfilled the planned tasks. We are definitely not going along with those who are still practicing self-conceit and yesterday's principles in their work with personnel. The interests of the people and state will dominate the government's activities.

We have apparently revealed another misfortune. During differentiation of the functions of soviet and party offices, many of the Councils' ispolkoms are extremely unwilling to take on greater burdens. They have long since forgotten how to be responsible and how to solve urgent problems. We understand that one of the main tasks of the Council of Ministers and its machinery is assisting those Councils so that they can gain strength and confidence, go more boldly about their activities and assume absolute authority in their territories. Apparently, it will be necessary to re-instill a sense of urgency in all echelons of power toward dealing with events and the state of affairs.

[Correspondent] If you don't mind, Vladimir Surenovich, please tell us a little about yourself. What do you believe in, what do you live for, what do you hate?

[V. Markaryants] I have seriously believed in restructuring for a long time, and in good people to whom I am always very drawn. I live for work, I have been brought up that way since I was small -I started working at the mill at the age of 14. And I hate, like every other normal person, mercenariness, slovenliness and insincerity. I cannot stand demagogues, unfinished work, and in general, imitation of activity. Recently I have realized that I hate nationalism.

...A secretary looked in at the door and reminded us of the time. The prime minister of the republic's Sunday work day continued.

Unauthorized 20 Feb Yerevan Demonstration Reported

18300469b Yerevan *KOMMUNIST* 22 Feb 89 p 2

[Armenpress report]

[Text] The election campaign for the USSR people's deputies is being conducted within the framework of political reform being carried out in the country, further improvement of democracy and expansion of glasnost. Pre-election meetings are feverishly being held under conditions of free competition between the candidates and broad discussion of the proposed programs.

Under these conditions, the action and activities of isolated groups, which are blockading the buildings where the local election commission is meeting, are absolutely intolerable. They are trying to enter the premises without warrants and invitation cards and are disrupting the normal work of the commission.

This situation arose in particular on 20 February at the building of the ispolkom of the Sovetskiy Rayon of Yerevan. A group of people carrying placards surrounded the building and, violating legal regulations, demanded immediate registration of their candidates in addition to the three officially registered candidates.

The crowd, openly taking advantage of the principles and concepts of democracy, shouted demagogical slogans and openly violated the established regulations and public order.

Using megaphones, the police detail present repeatedly asked the citizens to disperse and gave painstaking explanations, as a result of which most of the people dispersed. However, several young people continued to violate public order, for which four of them were placed under administrative arrest.

We are all learning democracy and taking the first steps toward creating a legal government, and we should not forget that democracy cannot exist without political culture, responsibility and duty. A legal government primarily requires strict observance by all citizens of the existing laws.

Official Report On Dispersion of 8 Mar Yerevan Disturbances

18300469c Yerevan *KOMMUNIST* 10 Mar 89 p 4

[Report from the Ispolkom of the Yerevan City Soviet, Military Commandant of the Special Region]

[Text] In the republic's capital and rayons, where a curfew is in effect, troops and the offices of the Ministry of Internal Affairs are controlling the situation.

Nevertheless, on 8 March a group of irresponsible people attempted to organize unauthorized measures and incite people to carry out illegal acts. The administration of the city's party and soviet offices, as well as the commandant's office of the special region, explained the seriousness of the situation to the citizens who had gathered, and the crowd began to disperse.

However, isolated elements moved toward Bagarmyan and Lenin Prospects for provocative purposes and tried to go out onto V. I. Lenin Square, disrupting the operation of public transportation. Violating the regulations of the special situation and curfew, they incited passions, displayed signs and placards which contradicted the ideas and aspirations of our people and shouted irresponsible slogans. This all roused justifiable indignation in the populace.

Other illegal actions were suppressed by the offices for the protection of public order. Appropriate measures will be taken against the organizers and most active instigators of the disturbances.

During the past two months, instances of unauthorized gathering of citizens, attempts to organize processions and display slogans and placards and demonstrations of a disrespectful attitude toward street patrol officers have become more frequent.

The administration of the military commandant's office reminds the inhabitants of Yerevan and its rayons, where the curfew has been imposed, that under the conditions of the special situation, organizing and conducting unauthorized gatherings of citizens, processions, meetings and other public gatherings are categorically forbidden.

The ispolkom of the Yerevan City Soviet and the administration of the military commandant's office have warned the population of the capital that in the event of additional developments leading to a violation of public order and destabilization of the situation, additional measures will be taken to ensure observance of the curfew conditions.

The overwhelming majority of the republic is complying with the requirements of the curfew.

On 9 March, 43 people were arrested and 23 automobiles were confiscated in Yerevan for violating the curfew and moving about without passes, documents and personal authorizations.

Roundtable With 'Nevada,' 'Green Front'
18300583 Alma Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 15 Apr 89 p 2

[Roundtable materials prepared by L. Baydman: "Interaction"]

[Text] "The Problems and Future Development of Social Movements" was the topic at the regular "roundtable" meeting at the editorial office of KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA. Taking part in it were: M. Auezov, of 'Nevada'; M. Chkmbulatov, M. Kanevskaya and K. Zakhvatkin, of the Committee on Problems of the Aral Sea, Lake Balkhash, and the Ecology of Kazakhstan ('Green Front'); Yu. Khan from the 'Mercy' Society; and, V. Volosnikova, from the Youth Association Fund. KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA Assistant Editor V. Srybnykh, Ideological Department Chief Editor L. Baydman, and Candidate of Historical Sciences N. Chistyakov conducted the session.

A Position, and Not Opposition

This is how Murat Auezov, an activist in the "Nevada" movement, formulates his conception of the "roundtable" meetings.

[Auezov] I see a good omen in the fact that we—people who are not indifferent as to how we are living today, and where we are going to be tomorrow—have finally gotten together. The KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA initiative to explore at least a few of the aspects of the activities of public associations has, in my own understanding, far-reaching goals. It is truly high time for us to understand some things, to delve into some things; and to separate the wheat from the chaff, the meeting-hysteria from broad and constructive dialog on questions of our common existence; to consolidate the forces of people who are not socially indifferent, who actively oppose whatever hinders the progress of perestroika.

Among the lasting problems which I have in mind is that complex ecological situation which is taking shape in a number of regions in the republic. Therefore, at today's meeting it would probably make sense to not so much discuss problems of the ecology as such, as to discuss the principles of the voluntary movements themselves, their internal problems and their social orientation.

For what reason has such a necessity come about just now?

Almost every time a truly serious and urgent problem requires solution, instead of working out a concrete program and proposing a methodology for solution, we get all unhinged and start shouting... But you see this can only discredit the social voluntarism of the masses, diminish its role and significance, and lead in the final analysis to destabilization.

When a social movement whose purpose is to solve ecological or other problems has just been born, when it is brought about by a spontaneous upsurge without a specific plan of action, that is understandable. But today another concept must also be understood—that of the civic responsibility, which every voluntary association must possess. Passion cannot be a substitute for serious work. Responsibility and discipline: that is what we have lacked up to now. And this has often brought the most noble upsurges to naught; their lack has led to the actual dissipation of the social energies of the masses. This should probably be described as the "epoch of meeting-democracy."

In my view, the conflicts which have arisen while attempting to solve the practical questions at the same time that spontaneous initiatives have sprung up, today requires not only new views on the phenomena, but also consolidation and coordination of the movements themselves.

No, it is not at all a question of placing them under a certain kind of formalized control—then we would go right back to where we started; but a question of operating together, while solving our own circle of problems. Perhaps today's meeting will become the first step on that journey.

[Moderator] Some time ago the so-called "Alma-Ata Popular Front" laid claim to leadership of the "overall activities of unofficial movements." According to its program, the Popular Front would: "Conduct mass measures, ecological and political campaigns; organize collective discussion of draft legislation, and also develop alternative draft legislation and present it to the Soviets for examination; and, work out theoretical questions of cooperation with perestroika..."

[Response] There is no point in bringing this up: the "Popular Front" did not receive any popular support in Alma Ata. And not least of all because of its ambitiousness, and the eclectic confusion which lay at the basis of its platform; and its ambitious claims to leadership of everyone and everything, turning independent organizations into a means of conducting "front policy," which was aimed more at confrontation than consolidation of forces; hence the totally one-sided attitude toward it.

[Auezov] Yes, that is one of the significant aspects: to have a position, or to be in opposition? To do one's business or to philosophize on every pretext imaginable? Guided by just such considerations, I joined the "Nevada" movement.

Its program today is already sufficiently well-known: to ban production and testing of nuclear weapons. Such a position not only does not conflict with the moral conceptions of other movements, it also creates a common platform for uniting all "ecologists." But I will make the following proviso right away: there can be no talk whatsoever of setting up some kind of "general offices;" rather, consolidating the socially-active forces and setting up something in the way of a coordinating center.

The necessity for such self-administration is dictated by life itself, and requires quite a bit of political art. The processes being developed in society most not only be supported, but the energy released must be directed into a channel which the people need—not eroding the banks of the spring floods of democracy; not breaking them down with the pressure of the elements, creating new gullies, but coordinating the social creativity of the masses. And here, I would point out, there must be objectivity on the part of the mass information media, which formulate public opinion and provide an analysis of this or that movement. With rare exceptions—there's a black sheep in every family—activists in the spontaneous movements are truly selfless people; movers, who are sincerely striving to do good. They should be supported and strengthened in the acknowledging their correctness.

[Moderator] The meeting at the Kazakhstan Writers' Society, at which "Nevada" was established, was held on the last day of February; yet as early as the first days of March, people were aware of this new movement, its platform and its program, and not only in the republic.

[Auezov] The first testimony to the emergence of "Nevada" was dictated by necessity. The idea, as they say in such instances, was hanging on the air... All that was needed was a small push, in order that thousands of people who had long been alarmed at the situation—not only in the area of the nuclear test range and the territory contiguous to it, but also of the existence of atomic weapons in general.

In my view a unique situation took shape, when we, the citizens of Kazakhstan, regardless of our ethnic origins, considered ourselves one family, which acutely felt the danger of a coming disaster. Of course, at the level of individual consciousness everyone understood what the testing of nuclear devices, which has been going on for several decades, might lead to. But there remained an absurd conviction, that the disaster would come to be recognized by itself, and the blasts which tore the earth—and our souls—would someday cease...

But "by itself" signifies only the negation, first of all; secondly, the establishment of "Nevada" does not yet mean the tests themselves have ceased, nor has Semipalatinsk Test Range closed. And nevertheless this is recognition of danger at a new social level of understanding, the recognition of oneself as a social force which must be dealt with.

We are beginning to think in new categories common to all mankind, and therein lies the uniqueness of the situation, which has brought our movement to life.

[Response] While you are orienting on categories common to all mankind, everyone is standing pat and everything is altogether logical. But at the very same time a certain uneasiness has arisen: are we not weakening our defensive capability? According to available information, certain capital organizations have refrained from actively supporting "Nevada." How should this be understood: the typical fear of new things, or stereotypic thinking?

[Auezov] I am inclined to take the following point of view: There are losses in every cause, the moreso when it is unexpected and unusual. After all, "Nevada's" platform, if one looks at things in a pre-perestroika traditional manner, one could explain things not as a civic view on the struggle for nuclear disarmament, but as something on the order of "bourgeois pacifism," liable to cause harm to the state's ability to defend itself.

Hence, no doubt, there is a certain amount of uneasiness. You see, we have become inured to the idea that demonstrations against atomic testing are possible "over there," but not in our country.

What, however, is the dialectic about?

It is about struggling, together with the government, for banning further testing, the consequences of which will have an affect not only at some future time, but are already having an effect today.

"Nevada" is appealing to all citizens in the republic to rally to the movement, and has explained the essence of its platform. Its text has been translated into our basic languages; it has been sent to the United Nations Organization, and was passed to the United States' Ambassador.

"Nevada," as I've already said, was established a month ago; but from its very first days it has been receiving hundreds of letters demanding the elimination of all atomic test ranges.

There are letters signed by dozens, hundreds of people. The sense of the letters is—to forbid for all time the production and development of atomic weapons: everywhere; in any form; on any place on the Earth.

[Moderator] What is hindering the development of popular initiatives? What must be undertaken in order to unite all the forces speaking out from positions of perestroika? It is not news that from time to time sharp conflicts arise between the official authorities and the voluntary associations. What sort of mechanism could there be to resolve them?

[Auezov] The reason for the conflict is found in different ways of evaluating one and the same fact. At the very same time the strength of any movement lies in its realism, in order that it has sufficient capability and energy. "Nevada" cannot ban nuclear testing on its own authority; everyone understands that. Through its actions it can only exert influence on those powers who have been given the authority to make decisions on the state level. And that is the task we have set for ourselves. At a "single point of contact," it is impossible to ban all nuclear production. Moreover, one must think about just what must be banned. After all, just like the wheel, mankind cannot get anywhere without nuclear energy. But social expertise is needed, which would keep such production under continual control.

I want to be properly understood. The idea and the significance of "Nevada" are so serious, that we rule out extremism—all kinds, in any manifestation whatsoever—and the inevitable sound effects that accompany it. Social expertise must possess the right to receive objective information about the radiation level in the republic; and in case of necessity, which gives rise to a state of alarm, the right of appeal to the people.

I presume that in such a situation, the military will have a more responsible attitude toward their professional duty.

[Response] But after all, you will possess that information which the military comrades offer you "for your discretion."

[Auezov] In case of necessity, "Nevada" will form an independent expert commission to check on the specific facts. The information from it can then be compared with that received from the military department. And if there is a considerable difference, we shall conduct our own kind of [legal] "confrontation" [ochnaya stavka].

One cannot exclude the fact that the data will at times be conflicting. On the other hand, we must rule out any kind of [physical] confrontation [konfrontatsiya]. It would never further the interests of the cause, in any way, shape or form. After all, confrontation and adherence to principle—are different concepts. Let us from the very beginning rule out, that the military are making up some kind of secret intrigues behind the people's backs. Everyone wants their people to live in security on their native land, and no one needs to conjure up his own idea of the enemy. It is another thing to make use of various criteria in evaluating the fact. But do these contradictions really not promote constructive thinking?

Wherein Lies the Prowess of a Business Manager?

With this question, Murat CHIMBULATOV, who represents the ecological movement at our meeting, began his talk.

[Chimbulatov] By education and occupation, I am a geologist. For more than a quarter-century I have been ranging far and wide throughout the republic. But for some time I have been very sorrowful: after the geologists, after their discoveries, others take up their work on the land—for which not only one's heart, but one's incorporeal soul is wounded.

In the 1960's I was working on the shores of the Aral Sea. It was a sweet, warm sea filled with the famous Aral chub and wild carp; with a multitude of fishing villages along the shores. In a word, it was life in all its beauty and strength.

And then I found myself there in 1987.

Salt was piled up like snowdrifts.

Eloquence is not necessary; I am a pragmatic man: the environment is not a man; it was not created for vengeance. But the salt storms, which several times a year cover Turkestan and Chimkent, reaching as far as Dzhambul—they could be called such. More and more changes are already being recorded in the entire Central Asian and Kazakhstan zone. Unusually intensive melting of glaciers has been observed also.

I am not telling you anything new. And there is no point in criticizing the past, to which we cannot return. But I would like to understand and give meaning to the Aral

catastrophe. And after I understand, I would like to ask all of us who are now living: why have we learned no serious lessons? Is it really not enough, what we created along the shores of the Aral Sea, and therefore we plan to create something similar along the Caspian shores? But I will be specific.

Not long ago I was present at a meeting of a public council of Goskompriroda [State Committee on Environmental Protection], which was discussing a plan for organizing the Karachaganak gas-condensate deposits. And while I was listening I was thinking: Are we not once again doing something, after which we will have to establish another fund or movement to save the Caspian Littoral?

In 1985 I waded across the Syr-Darya. Will we indeed be forced to cross the Ural some day in this same manner?

But gas is needed, they object; condensate is needed. Of course. Who says otherwise. However, are there really no other solutions, less harmful for the river?

Every economic interest is dictated by its own internal mechanism. The developers of Karachaganak are thinking about not only to extract gas and condensate, but cheap gas and condensate. And this is an altogether praiseworthy decision. The difference is only in the understanding of what is more costly and what is cheaper. It is more advantageous to the ministry to construct an aqueduct to the Ural than to extend it another 120 kilometers to the mighty basin of the Aktyubinsk artesian wells.

For comparison: over a billion rubles have been allocated for developing Karachaganak—but only 170,000 for environmental protection measures.

However, I just cannot grasp, why the department sees no interest in letting the activists from the ecological movement propose their solutions? After all, that way there are greater guarantees not to err, nor to run afoul.

And why indeed should they not enter into cooperation with the people who are actively interested in protecting the environment? And from our side, not to raise clouds of dust, behind which one can hardly see, but to seek constructive compromises? I said and I caught myself on the phrase, "from our side." As if we were at the barricades. For there is after all only one "side," a single one for us all.

The present level of the volunteer movement is, in my view, not completely effective. For one thing, the result rate is not high enough. For another, it is disconnected, and lacks "points of contact," between which there are zones of unconsciousness.

I have cited Karachaganak here as an example. There, serious problems are already springing up on protecting the environment, the pressure on which is becoming so great, that the delicate balance may be upset.

[Response] And to this day, in the fourth year of perestroika, the basic prowess of the business manager lies in—taking as much as possible. No one, after all, can see what they are doing there, under the earth. And what a great conscience one must have in order to see what is hidden, but not expose it. The sad experience of Samotlor showed us...

[Chimbatov] Very strict public expertise must be brought to bear on the development of new mineral deposits. Of course not the meeting-variety, which Murat Mukhtarovich had in mind, but at a sufficiently high professional level, and with a profound sense of social responsibility.

[Moderator] Of course, that is very important, and is badly needed—that activists from the ecological movements are seeking approaches to optimal solutions for vast problems. The extraction of gas and condensate is a matter that is not without danger to the environment. It must be approached very carefully, after considerable thought. But at the very same time... Our animal-husbandry projects, for entirely understandable reasons, are situated near water reservoirs. Over the winter months, thousands of tons of manure pile up next to the farms, and in the Spring—it is not a rare event—bulldozers push it into the rivers and lakes... What—are there no people in the countryside interested in protecting the environment, or is everything there "green" already?

[Chimbatov] A practical observation—We begin to talk about our problems only when the situation becomes critical. And you see, things are not being put into order, and that must be supported. It would seem elementary, but such are the phenomena of our mentality—it is much easier to master the complex than to understand the simple things. Everyone understood the problems of the Aral Sea and Lake Balkhash. But you see to clean up the Alma Ata irrigation canals, which regulate the micro-climate, and to put the sanitary situation in order in the city—these are already complex matters: the zones of unconsciousness of which I just spoke.

For today, the ecologists are not satisfied with the action of the Minvodkhoz [Ministry of Land Improvement and Water Conservation], Minkommunkhoz [Ministry of Municipal Services] and Gosagroprom [State Agro-Industrial Commission] in the region of the Sorbulak Lake reservoir. Or still another problem: neither the "Green Front" nor other social movements have seriously grappled with the problems of new construction in the cities—Alma Ata in particular. What purpose does it serve to give one's consent now, and not seek the ends; but the city blocks have long since gotten longer, creating artificial screens which prevent normal ventilation. Even in the Samal microregion, which was constructed to the

last word of architecture, it turned out, was obstructed from one end to the other. And so, what can one do today? The only thing is—not repeat the mistake. But we keep repeating and repeating them, over and over...

In this connection I would like to return once again to what Murat Mukhtarovich was talking about. The development of social initiative leads to a situation which makes it necessary to both consolidate and coordinate all the civic movements interested in the success of perestroika.

Objectively it turns out that "Nevada," in the situation which has evolved, is becoming one of the leading social forces in the republic. And it is altogether logical if it takes upon itself the role of coordinator of the other ecological movements. Our splintering and narrowness of interests and capabilities are hindrances to successful solution of acute problems. I am not talking about this with all certainty, but I do pose the question: would it not be expedient for the Committee on Problems of the Aral Sea, Lake Balkhash and the Ecology of Kazakhstan, together with all its "fronts," to unite with "Nevada," which has already received international recognition? This would be not simply combining forces, but a force multiplier. After all, speaking frankly—if we in the extraction industry continue to do business as we have up to now, without any difficulty whatsoever we shall do ourselves irreparable damage. We are not far from a situation in which entire regions will be turned into one solid mining dump, the maintenance of which is far from harmless to the environment. It is always the very same logic: to extract as many natural resources as fast as we can...

[Response] And let our descendants worry about the consequences!

[Chimbatov] Exactly. We have not seriously concerned ourselves with comprehensive raw-material use, and how to extract all the components from them. Instead, we dig new pits and new mines. In one place we send lead to the waste heap because we are interested in copper; in another zinc goes to waste, because the enterprise is oriented on lead...

At the same time, here is what we need to pay attention to: Are certain of our movements—including the ecological movement—not turning into a kind of "monitoring organ?" It is not enough to simply "point out" the shortcomings. Ways to resolve them must be sought out, and not only on a theoretical plane. This is our Achilles' heel—we hold useful dialogues, but do not follow them with useful deeds...

Not long ago we prepared to defend documentation on the Aktogay mineral deposits. And suddenly Mintsvetmet [Ministry of Non-Ferrous Metallurgy] declares, that its ores are not suitable, and therefore they are not processing them. We put some materials together, studied the history, and with its help appealed to an elderly,

retired technologist who lives in Moscow. The little old lady spent two weeks in the laboratory performing her magic, and solved all the problems: the Aktogay ore processes beautifully.

And this is the point: how much raw materials and how many billions could we save, if we seriously occupied ourselves with the technology of reprocessing mining wastes; and how many pits would we thereby not have to dig?

[Moderator] What is the essence and the meaning of today's dialogue on the need for public expertise, on enlisting the popular masses to participate in monitoring the work of certain enterprises and entire industries, which has a pernicious effect on the environment? It is not, of course, to compare and contrast public opinion with the official point of view. And it is not at all about opposition.

We have not spoken about the need for public expertise because we have the good life. Dumping of poisonous wastes into water reservoirs, mining wastes that are dangerous to the environment—which could be put to good use in business—and technological helplessness: would these not require experts and expert analysis if such incidents had not taken place?

Nature is a Single Entity

And therefore an understanding of nature must be unified as well. Everything in nature is interconnected, as in the human organism, if not on an even higher level. Such is the opinion of Marta KANEVSKAYA, who, along with her "Zemlya" [The Earth] group, has joined forces with the Green Front.

[Kanevskaya] Crudely tampering with the environment in one place has loud, resounding repercussions in another.

We criticize, and not without cause, various ministries not because they organize the extraction of materials which our economy needs, but for plundering the environment, and irrational use of resources. But you see we too, the activists in the social movements, are not working all that "comprehensively" either: it's everyone for himself. The fact that new initiatives are springing up is a good thing. But you see, there are in fact no working ties among them. Their efforts are scattered and they do not achieve their goals. Therefore the Alma Ata "Green Front" decided to integrate as the Committee on Problems of the Aral Sea, Lake Balkhash, and the Ecology of Kazakhstan. We shall continue to follow the same line as we have up to now. But we shall be coordinating our work with the movement that has the most influence, that has the greatest ability to resolve and the most

energy to influence the ecological situation in the republic as a whole. Today we do indeed have an understanding of the kind of methodology used by ecologists in other regions of Kazakhstan, that has placed them at the center of public attention, and of just how effective their work is.

[Moderator] No doubt many of us know the parable of the two people who met, each of whom had an apple, and made an equivalent exchange with one another. How they had had an apple apiece, and that is what they wound up with...

But if the two had exchanged not apples, but ideas? Then each of them would have had two.

Indeed, although the scale of their problems vary, how much "Nevada," and the Committee on the Problems of Ecology of Kazakhstan, and the Green Front have in common! Moreover, they do not each have an "apple," but an idea. How many useful things they can do by combining efforts!

The Ecology of the Soul

—is what falls beyond the field of vision of our community. Such is the personally distressing discovery made by Yulia KHAN, one of the organizers of the Mercy Society in Alma Ata.

[Khan] I have been listening very carefully to what my comrades in the social movement have been saying. The affairs of state are placing them on the agenda. Of all problems, the ecology is truly number two, right after the problems of war and peace. But only because if the first comes to pass, there will be no one around to take up the second.

But who will point out; who knows, where mercy should be placed today; into which ecological niche should the human soul be placed...

We often hear that it is a cruel age. But why is it cruel? Because mercy, which from time immemorial has been an indicator of human maturity, has become...prejudiced. Instead of sisters of mercy, we have medical sisters. Those sacred words have become an embarrassment. Such are the grand achievements that are taking place on the level of social consciousness.

But the matter, as you understand, is not in the renaming of professions—milkmaids have also come to be called "milking-machine operators;" and yardmen, "public services and amenities experts." But that has not added to the milk supply, nor have the cities become cleaner. It turns out that we do not understand prestige in that sense.

Here is what we should be thinking about. If man is not the bearer of at least the basic principles of morality, what will he do? Will he struggle to preserve the environment, and take part in actions to ban nuclear testing? Hardly.

And that is the problem, the approaches to which are even more difficult than the problems being discussed here today; although I had no intention whatsoever of setting one off against the other. Perhaps this is the crux of the growing necessity for us to band more closely together: All of our objective reality is interrelated and interdependent.

The Mercy Society sprang up a year ago on the initiative of Alma Ata VUZ students. And this fact is, to me, especially noteworthy: that the conception of mercy has come to the young people, to the very ones who are filled with health and vitality; that is—the moral factor has "operated."

What has called this movement to life?

I too did not perceive things this way in the past...

A man, by dint of circumstances, has become—and there is no point in going into detail here—totally isolated. He cannot leave his house; sometimes he cannot even get up. He has forgotten what hot food is. And no one remembers him, just as if he had been crossed off the list of the living.

Can you imagine anything more serious, if you put yourself in that position?

Does everyone know what it is to receive a 19-ruble pension, on which one can neither live nor die? But even among those who know this, many try to pass it off as if nothing special is going on.

How then can one be a human being?

Any answer to that question is not the entire answer. We do not think about that fact that, by our impersonal attitude toward the fate of our fellow-citizen who finds himself in a critical situation, we are not only cultivating in other people indifference toward another's suffering—we are cultivating cruelty, and social isolation. To such people it's all the same, whether atomic weapons rend our Earth; or whether the Aral Sea perishes. After all, everything proceeds from man—but if there is in him zero social culture?

When we banded together as the Mercy Society, we understood how tragically the fate of many of our fellow-citizens had taken shape; and then we used to think, that it was sufficient for others to find out about them, and we would then get everything necessary to create conditions worthy of a human being for these people.

But we were naive. People did not at all take a merciful attitude toward "Mercy." We do not even have a permanent roof over our heads. The Alma Ata gorispolkom had at one time adopted a resolution that accommodations would be allocated to us by last December. But time marches on, and there are none. The deputy chairperson of the gorispolkom explained the situation to us succinctly and clearly: "There are so many of you."

But for the time being, "we" are only in Leningrad and Alma Ata. But that is not the point, how many we are. The gorispolkom is simply demonstrating that "Mercy" is unnecessary; although people need our help very badly. Unfortunately.

[Response] What are you deploring? That people need you?

[Khan] Exactly. It would better if they didn't need us. But life has evolved in such a way, that they—those under our care, the helpless and the alone—amount to 1,700 people in the capital. And we are becoming for them the only connecting link with the world, with life itself. Activists from "Mercy," and we already number 200 persons—clean apartments and make necessary repairs. For the completely helpless, we plan to organize hot meals, and for the indigent we are opening a special dining hall. But so many people need moral support, simply a kind word. Here, telephone contact would no doubt be a great help. And we would like to organize such a duty service. But...

We let us return to the previous circle.

There are also a lot of other concerns.

We would like, for example, to organize a theater for children suffering from oncological diseases. They cannot visit the Pioneer camps, and cannot engage in physical culture. But they need at least a little joy...

"Mercy" has taken under its wing the children's oncological surgery department and a hospital of the same profile on Shmelev St. But their needs are critical. The more so since there are in general not enough hospital attendants at the treatment facilities.

[Response] On the whole, your impressions on the first year of "Mercy's" existence are not very happy ones...

[Khan] Not very. Everything must be obtained by begging, just like alms. In Alma Ata there are dozens of enterprises which possess assets worth many millions, and if they allocate a hundred rubles or so to the fund, they really think they've done a great thing. It is cost-accounting [khozaschet], they say. Mercy on a cost-accounting basis? Doesn't that say it all?

[Response] Not all. The society announced its establishment on 3 December last year, and in January the legendary KRU [Inspection and Auditing Administration] subjected "Mercy" to a complete audit. On this plane, genuine "concern" was shown.

[Khan] Yes, that event took place; but let that be on the conscience of the auditors...

I would like to say this about the responsibility for everything that takes place in our voluntary movement. Sometimes we raise too much of a noise, as if we were admiring ourselves from the sidelines. Glasnost is one of the first achievements of perestroyka; and we must strengthen its mechanism in every possible way. But we must not exploit this instrument and do ourselves harm. Discipline is the most important condition of glasnost. These two concepts must not be taken separately. And we—are thinking; moreover, very often irresponsibly, not thinking of the consequences. My comrades here have spoken of consolidation and coordination of social movements. That is a necessary thing. But another must be stressed as well—the personal responsibility of the leader for everything that goes on in this association or another. Responsibility before the people and before the law. You see, more than once it has happened that adventurers and genuine rascals have wormed their way into a fine enterprise, which has brought disfavor on the voluntary movement. There is a heavy price to pay for such carelessness. The cause which we have taken up is too serious to permit just anyone access to it.

It Was Not For Fun

—that the Fund for Young People's Associations was established, which its leader, Valentina Volosnikova, describes.

[Volosnikova] We did not arrive at the idea of organizing a fund intuitively, of course, but rather by trial and error. The comrades here who represent the various movements have repeatedly stressed that consolidation and coordination of all civic action is needed. Our fund has become a kind of coordinator. Today it comprises an association of artists, medical people, designers, engineers, scientific-technical workers, construction organizations and a student association.

Here is the kind of activeness that perestroyka has called into being.

How were they to get together without the fund? How would it have been possible to solve the problems common to everyone only by virtue of the fact that they are "all" young and socially-interested in restructuring life. The fund supports their various initiatives, and renders material assistance, especially at first.

No doubt our association is the noisiest in the whole capital. Discussions, disputes, debates—there are always a lot of people there. As one old lady living next door put it, "I find it disagreeable to look at you, at those always having meetings..."

But we were not in conference; we are up to our ears in dust—which is the truth in this instance. This is during the meetings, and in the intervals between business. But the fellows work seriously, and they are also earning seriously, according to all the principles of cost accounting.

The fund has set up a bank for solving social and charitable programs. A puppet theater has been opened at its expense, and a children's ecology club has been set up.

[Response] Of course, doing business with scientific-technical workers or artists is not a very great burden...

[Volosnikova] It's not a burden with anyone. If something is onerous, it doesn't pay to take up such a matter. But it is not just the young people, who have only just organized themselves, who are members of the fund. Not so long ago, for example, several groups of juveniles with an extremely-specific social orientation came to us. We took them in, bought them musical instruments, and got down to business. Today they are not quite yet good little boys, but neither are they the kind who are terrorizing the defenseless residents of the blocks. These young people are quietly acquiring genuine culture.

They didn't think that the fund could achieve complete intellectual independence and material self-sufficiency, or freedom of choice and decision. But this is now a fact.

[Response] It's as if the young people themselves took that step, the need for which grown-ups are now reflecting on...

Consolidation of Forces

—that is what we absolutely need today. And to no less degree than the social revolution needed in its day. That is how Kirill ZAKHVATKIN, an activist on the Committee on Problems of the Ecology of Kazakhstan, poses the question.

[Zakhvatkin] No movement that is cut off from the masses can accomplish anything remotely useful for society. Its ideology must be affirmed at the level of social consciousness the public mind possesses. We have had a lot of discussions in our time about the Green Front. And a lot more than it has actually done or could have done. The movement has called much more attention to itself by its "revolutionary nature," than by its practical deeds.

I am firmly convinced that the social mission of Green Front is for its ideas, its views and its principles to permeate every apartment, every doorway, every home. Even a child, starting with kindergarten, simply must to comprehend the ABC's of ecological culture. And then we shall truly be able to move the cause off dead center. After all, what kind of "front" is it if only the "ordinary unenlightened" support it? Because of such massive unpreparedness, perhaps we shall be unable to overcome the situation and not influence it, while we substitute declarations for action.

Just look around at what is being done. Our forestry administration plans to make thousands of cubic meters of pulpwood out of the surviving fir groves of the Zailinskiy Alatau—Minister Zaytsev says, "for the normal operation of their experiment and testing enterprises." They are already building a road in the mountains, and soon the splinters will be flying. And this in a place where a National Park should be established. Well, how can one comprehend such a thing?

It seems to me that it would make sense for the Green Front to become one of the wings of "Nevada." The time has come for consolidation of forces. It is time for us to act, not as individuals under one's own flag, but to bear the Banner common for everyone.

[Moderator] Consolidation of social movements on a political platform of perestroika was the basic subject of our "round table" discussion. The main thing defined was, that the activists of the most varied civic initiatives, from the youth initiative to the recently-established "Nevada," have spoken out for coordinating their efforts and operating by various methods, but in the same direction. Struggling against atomic weapons testing; defending the environment against barbaric influences on it; summoning mercy in the people's souls; creating for young people conditions for their self-affirmation in life—all of these are in essence interconnected to a single goal.

Of course it is not a question of some kind of formal "merger," subordinating one to another, or dividing up the spheres of influence. Something else entirely is being discussed: the necessity for multiplying the power of the social movements, so that they might more energetically attempt to solve the very widest spectrum of problems of national importance. To acquire genuine influence and political prestige in society; in order to speak their own words in the name of the people and in the name of their interests, without setting off one conception against another, but operating together in order to work out the optimal solutions—such is the main idea of our common work.

**Deputy Interviewed on Work of Group
Investigating Tbilisi Events**

18300620 Tbilisi MOLODEZH GRUZII in Russian
20 Apr 89 pp 4-6

[Interview with Yegor Yakovlev by Irina Kuparadze and Mikhail Yeligulashvili: "'How Imperfect Our Government Must Be, If Such a Thing Could Happen'"]

[Text] After the tragic events in Tbilisi, a group of people's deputies from the USSR Cinematographers Union was approached by People's Deputy Eldar Shengelaya and other representatives of the Georgian public with the request to form an independent deputies' group to assess what had happened. The following deputies spent several days in Tbilisi: B. Vasilyev, a writer; A. Gelman, a playwright; D. Lunkov, a documentary filmmaker from Saratov; M. Belikov, a film director from Kiev; and Ye. Yakovlev, the editor of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI. We met with Yegor Vladimirovich Yakovlev on 15 April and asked him to answer a number of questions.

[MOLODEZH GRUZII] What goals has this representative deputies' commission set for itself?

[Yakovlev] Each one of us has his own tasks and lines of endeavor. For my part it also involves targeting the newspaper, because we intend to recount the Tbilisi events in order to highlight the necessity of a very thorough investigation. Incidentally, just prior to our departure for the meeting in the Cinematographers Union, Academician R. Sagdeyev brought in a letter from a group of Moscow intellectuals, in which it is stated that the events in Tbilisi showed what kind of danger perestroika is in, and they are ready to help in every way to determine the truth and organize cooperation with specialists and scientists. Naturally, the group of deputies will prepare general material which will offer a political assessment of what happened. We will have to figure out whether it was a mistake, a crime, or a dangerous scenario which was tested in Tbilisi so that it might be repeated later in any other part of the Union. Especially since in the Center, in Moscow, just as in Tbilisi, we came up against a complete absence of glasnost in regard to the events of 9 April. The information that is given out is one-sided and unobjective. Perestroika cannot bear up under such a burden of lies.

These, then, are our basic goals—to show, using the example of Tbilisi, that political reform is lagging in our country. I am in agreement with M. S. Gorbachev, who speaks of the urgency of perestroika. The elections in Leningrad and Moscow gave grounds for talk that everything was fine here in that regard. But then the events in Tbilisi took place, and it turned out that it was not like that at all, that martial law was put into effect here, authorized by the authorities. If the present state of

democracy in the country makes such measures and situations possible, we cannot say that political reform has been accomplished and is running ahead of everything else.

Second. The example of Tbilisi gives an idea of how relations with the informals are being developed. In effect, the question of power [vlast] is being decided in this process. By what means? Either a striving on the part of the party system and other social forces to go in one direction via compromises, or constant confrontation between these structures in the struggle for power. At the 19th Party Conference, one obkom secretary proclaimed the following: Who in the long run is doing perestroika—we party workers or these 'informals'? He forgets that, while he is a party worker, he is at the same time an ordinary citizen like everyone else.

Third. The question of the political responsibility for what happened. Ultimately the investigation will show how aggressive the actions of the informals on the square were and to what extent their leaders were to blame. It will show to what extent the decisions of the republic's leadership were justified. Judging by the findings of the recent Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum, the mistakes that were committed were doubled.

A no less important point—the fourth—is that of responsibility to the victims. We visited the hospitals today, and the mothers of the sufferers literally threw themselves at us. We had to listen to a lot of bitter and harsh words. You can understand these mothers. Poisonous chemicals were used; this is acknowledged by the minister of health, and, under the pressure of facts, by the military people as well. But the latter do not want to give recommendations on how to treat the victims. Moreover, if the accounts of brutality on the part of the soldiers are confirmed, they must be made to answer for it. We cannot allow the army to remain anonymous. At present it looks like the army was an uncontrolled organism: They came, did their business, and left.

How imperfect our government is today if you can ask for and bring in the troops and, what's more, give a mistaken order. Clearly, there will be a number of other conclusions drawn in addition to these, which will be essential to ensure that the tragedy is not repeated in some other part of the Union. Any clash here or somewhere else is a big gift to the opponents of perestroika.

[MOLODEZH GRUZII] Another question arises. On the one hand, for understandable reasons, trust in the investigation is less than complete. On the other hand, however, representatives of public control [kontrol obshchestvennosti]—and the people do not doubt their honesty—are insufficiently competent in purely professional terms.

[Yakovlev] What we need from the public control representatives is not necessarily competence but rather a civic stance and, especially, a political assessment of the events. It is from this position that the public needs to monitor the professional investigation. Are there people in the hospitals who have all the symptoms of being poisoned with unknown chemical substances? Then that is enough to necessitate asking further questions: What kind of substances were they? Who gave the command to use them? Who used them?

[MOLODEZH GRUZII] Both when they took the decision to bring in the troops, and now, when the measures taken by the government are being reported, we ordinary citizens are finding out about the end result. Again, as so often before, the decision-making mechanism remains unknown, and how roles are assigned remains a secret. Inevitably, therefore, it is difficult to speak of leadership's personal responsibility.

[Yakovlev] What took place in Tbilisi is a weighty argument in favor of breaking up this secrecy. You have come up against a specific situation and, therefore, you have the right to insist upon sorting out the facts and persons. To speak in general about open government.... This does not seem very serious to me. For example, the suggestion has been made more than once that meetings of the Politburo, for example, be televised by direct relay. There is an absolutely reasonable objection to this: the Politburo is an ordinary working body whose activities involve disputes, clashing ideas and positions. The glare of the floodlights would one way or another make its mark on the normal course of business in the meetings. The operation of the government, to some extent, is never accessible to absolutely everyone; it is not a speaker's platform in the square.

[MOLODEZH GRUZII] Let's return to the subject of glasnost. What's happening? Has glasnost reached a dead end?

[Yakovlev] Since the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th Party Conference we have been put in a unique position. We, the press, have not been able to keep up with our political potential, which has run ahead of our practice. This is natural, because you don't go to sleep mute and wake up talking. Freedom of the press takes more than joy; it takes ability.

Let's turn again to specific things. What tasks do I see facing your republic youth newspaper today? That of working out a position in regard to various social forces, the ability to find a compromise and bring both sides to that compromise. To act against impatience (impatience, in my opinion, is the chief enemy of perestroika) on both sides. The tragedy in Tbilisi further polarized people who were already estranged. And the more they drift apart, the worse things will get.

In my pre-election program, one of the main points was this: Glasnost is the first step on the path to society's democratization. Under the present deployment of forces, the fact that the old structure of commanding the press remains in place, without an independent press, there can be no democracy. Let's take a look backwards: When the press was forbidden, it kept silent; when it was authorized, it started to yell. Hence, there is a danger that they will "cut off the water" again.

I believe that sooner or later, the informal organizations and movements will also have their own press organs; they cannot survive without them. There's no such thing as "getting just a little bit pregnant." MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI is now creating a kind of European "Club of Six"—six European press organs will put out a joint newspaper devoted to the general values of humanity and to ecological problems. It's kind of funny: it's easier for us to make a deal about a new publication abroad than in this country.

[MOLODEZH GRUZII] The process of society's democratization requires the presence of a mass of opposition structures. Until they have legal status, there will always be the danger that they will not be heard—there are those who will not wish to hear them—and consequently there will be no dialogue; consequently, there will always be the possibility of a repetition of the clash in Tbilisi....

[Yakovlev] I am not ready to talk about legal status for an opposition, and in my opinion that is not the issue at this point. We should be talking about opposition structures [opponiruyushchiye struktury], whose role today can certainly be played by the newspapers, for example. Undoubtedly, the social organizations can also serve as such.... This is normal, and it is the only way. In our history there has always been a struggle for the mutual destruction of two camps: the Trotskyites and Stalinists, and so on. To me, Gorbachev's revolutionary character is reflected in the fact that he declared immediately that we are all in the same boat, on the same side of the barricades. At first, I was not very happy with that. I do not consider myself to be in the same boat with Saifonov, for example. On the other hand, however, I understood something else. I don't much like Pamyat, and I understand that if it had appeared about 10 years ago the whole outfit would have departed for distant parts, there to breathe the freezing air of Siberia. But I also know that if Pamyat goes today, tomorrow it will be me. I know for certain that if some progressive camp is victorious today—but at the expense of another camp—that will be the end of perestroika. And we can put a sign on the victors' door reading "Thanks to Comrade Stalin for our happy childhood." I am not ill-disposed toward Yeltsin, but in my opinion he does not want to understand that you have to live on a two-way street.

Journalists have the task of consolidating against confrontation. However I feel about Pamyat, I must find a compromise with it rather than seek ways to destroy it.

Impatience on the part of the press is just as dangerous as with politicians. At a meeting with journalists, Gorbachev noted correctly that there are those who think that when a newspaper criticizes everybody, that's democracy, but if you criticize the newspaper, that's suppression of democracy. Even the Law on the Press, if it is passed, is something I view not from the position of a journalist but from the standpoint of the possibility of protecting citizens against the dirty tricks that the press can play. How many heart attacks and wrecked careers it has on its conscience.... What the Central press did recently in regard to the events in Tbilisi is of that sort.

[MOLODEZH GRUZII] We believe that, judging by the results of the elections, opposition groups will also arise in the soviets. What is your opinion about this, and how do you assess the elections as a whole?

[Yakovlev] The elections came off with a big plus. I don't know about here, but in Moscow and Leningrad it was quite substantial. This is one more proof of the paramount importance of political reform. As a result of the elections, the very narrow circle of leaders of perestroika has been breached on a nationwide scale. Many people have come up from the provinces, people who were nominated by the voters and have the voters' support. For this reason, we do not now have the right to assess whether they are worthy or not. One time some American journalists asked me to compile a list of the most progressive people in the country. That's ridiculous. Am I supposed to claim that the Volgograd guy who "beat" Yu. Bondarev in the elections is progressive and Bondarev is not? Traditionally we tend to seek an alternative in specific names rather than in groups of people. The concept of the search needs to be changed. Why not seek the alternative in groups of deputies who will strive to consolidate with one another, finding compromise, rather than creating numerous factions which are always exchanging ultimatums? Such attempts are already being undertaken, even though there is still a month and a half to go before the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. This is a dangerous time.

[MOLODEZH GRUZII] Isn't there a danger that the Congress will turn into a babel and the deputies will get lost in a plethora of social programs?

[Yakovlev] The situation is understandable. Looking over the pre-election programs, we can see that they include everything that had been fermenting among the people for 70 years. The package of specific issues needs to be limited during the first Congress. In my opinion, there are three directions that should be paramount. Determination of the status of deputies (to whom all doors should be opened). The second point that needs to be dealt with at the Congress is the status of the Supreme Soviet, rotation procedures in the Supreme Soviet. The third point is to define the most immediate political measures. That is, the sequence rather than the implementation of the measures themselves. The way I look at it, we should not expect more from the first Congress.

[MOLODEZH GRUZII] Yegor Vladimirovich, here's a question from the dangerous sphere of political forecasting. Isn't it possible that perestroika might end with one man?

[Yakovlev] I don't think so. And anyway, what does it mean to say it will end or not? Let's look a little deeper. What did Khrushchev do, coming after Stalin? He exposed the man's direct crimes and mistakes. Was any forward progress made? In general, no. The system remained the same. Brezhnev corrected Khrushchev's direct mistakes, for example in agriculture, but he went no further than that, and it sank without a trace. Now for the first time we are seeing an attempt to create a different political structure. The elections are the first example of that. If, despite all the resistance, this basic reform succeeds, the structure will become self-perpetuating and assuring. If it does not, it will sink without a trace.

Perestroika, in my understanding, breaks down into three stages. In the first stage we thought that all we had to do was turn our armchair a little, loosen the knot in our tie, and everything would be fine. It was not just the journalists who thought that. Gorbachev himself emphasized several times that neither he nor the government as a whole had a clear idea of the extent of the egalitarianism [uravnilovka], or the level of corruption, or the degree of resistance to new developments in the depths of society.

The second period was dominated by the old mentality of finding the wrongdoer who was blocking perestroika. And some 18 million such functionaries surfaced, bureaucrats on which everything could be blamed. It reminded me of the story of the people who raised 100 wolves, let them go, and then rushed to catch them.

The third period started with the 19th Party Congress. We began to understand that it was not a matter of wrongdoers but that the existing state and political system itself fosters anti-perestroika. People are merely the vehicles of what the system produces.

But life goes on, and it will not do to wait until another system takes shape. There is not a single problem today that can be resolved in ideally clean laboratory conditions. Everything proceeds via the union of the old and the new, by breaking up customary views. We, the people of the system, can almost repeat along with Gogol: "We have all emerged from Stalin's tunic."

[MOLODEZH GRUZII] Keep on struggling? Wouldn't it be simpler to cross out everything that has been and start to build a new system?

[Yakovlev] I would not cut off like that. A rich man in Hamburg collected some of our "left-wing" artists and set up a "glasnost gallery." When I went through it I felt bad. My own 57 years have not been as tragic and

senseless as these kids paint it. They are not more than 35 or 36 years old. They paint things like "War in the Crimea Up in Smoke," although they were not in the war in Crimea.

There is a wonderful play by Merezhko called "The Proletarian Happiness Mill." It seems some guy in the early '30s built a happiness mill, something like a perpetual motion machine. It required wheels, which were taken from everybody's wagons. The chairman of the Poor Peasants Committee told the grumbling peasants to ride around on sledges and get used to happiness. Then it needed something else, and something else again. And when the village finally rose up against the mill, the chairman of the Poor Peasants Committee came and said, "All right, who's against happiness? Step forward and be shot!" To me, this is a very accurate picture of how we build our happy future.

When I hear today that they put a metallurgy combine into operation ahead of schedule in 1939, an association occurs to me: They would produce poor steel which German bullets would easily penetrate. But to the people who built that combine it was their life, their happiness, their joy.

What has happened in the course of 70 years, it seems to me, was to be expected. Consider, for example, the disputes revolving around the origin of Stalinism—whether it was engendered by the socialist system or was a phenomenon alien to it. It seems to me that Lev Karpinskiy has hit upon a very interesting image. He compares Stalinism with a cancerous tumor which develops in the organism's own cells and kills it.

Let's look at it from another angle. Stalin shot us. Khrushchev promised us communism by 1980. Brezhnev stole everything he could. But all it took was to remind us again of the ideals of socialism and we immediately went into action and forgot all about it. Here is proof—from the reverse—of the power of these ideas.

Just think why perestroika is such a raging success in the West. Not just because the Union is a great power. It is simply that the ideas of democratization and social justice are in short supply in the world. As soon as there is any hope, people go for it.

Tajik Student Teacher Riot Described by Victims; Cause Still Unresolved

18300493 Dushanbe KOMMUNIST TADZHIKISTANA
in Russian 24 Feb 89 p 3

[Eye-witness account of student teacher riot written by M. Lebedev and A. Cherepanov: "At the Hospital and the Police Station Is Where You Will Find the Participants in the Events of 20 February"]

[Text] After the telegraph agency's report of the suppression of the acts of hooliganism in Dushanbe on 20 February, the telephones at the editorial office rang off

the hook. Inquiries from the city's inhabitants poured in, as if they would never stop. Journalists were not at the scene of the incident and cannot give an eye-witness account of the events. We are presenting the words of those who were involved in the chain of events and those who in the line of duty prevented the conflict from spreading.

Some of the participants in the hooliganism at the technical school managed to force their way into the Tajikistan cinema where they began to beat the audience. The police also suppressed this hooliganism.

Abduvali Rakhmonov, head of the administration of internal affairs of the Dushanbe gorispolkom.

In order to investigate the events of 20 February, a strategical investigatory group was created which was headed by the deputy procurator of Dushanbe, Klych Kurbanov. Taking into account the great public response to the events, experienced employees from the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the procurator's office of the capital were assigned to assist the group.

The facts which we have at our disposal at the moment convince us that the two outbreaks of hooliganism mentioned (the time lapse between them was two hours, and none of those who participated in the first skirmish were involved in the second fight) were not related in any way. There was also no preparation for these events or any previously organized hooliganism to mention. The next day, we went around the neighboring dormitories of the youth village: some people had heard about the fight from our employees.

Those involved in the fight were not divided according to nationality, as is indicated by the last names of those participating in the skirmish at "Binokoron." And among those inhabitants of the microregion who burst into the dormitories were V. Ulyanov, A. Khakimov, V. Bondar and some Albert from Termez. The students at the technical school are also of different nationalities.

According to information from the ambulances, 64 people required medical attention and nine people were hospitalized the first night. One policeman was hospitalized. Five of our workers received injuries of varying severity.

There was great deal of material damage. Three trolley buses, one bus, two Volgas, one RAF, six police cars and private cars were damaged.

The hooliganism was suppressed. A total of 113 people were taken to the regional departments and Ministry of Internal Affairs for the purpose of analyzing and shedding light on the circumstances surrounding the hooliganism. Now we have to decipher all the circumstances surrounding the events which occurred. This, of course, requires time. We will inform the public of the outcome of our work.

And here are the accounts of others who participated in the events, with whom our correspondent spoke at the Republic Clinical Hospital No. 3.

A. Zubarev, athlete.

On Monday evening four of us were returning from the cafeteria. It was about 8 o'clock. Suddenly a group of kids came straight toward us. Without a word, they grabbed us and began beating us. One of us immediately managed to run away. The others apparently managed to later. I was beaten and kicked until I lost consciousness. When I came to, there was no one around. They had stolen my sports cap.

V. Tur, senior police lieutenant.

On that evening I was on duty at the Department of Internal Affairs of the Central Rayon. About 8:30 p.m. an alarm was raised: there was a fight near the industrial pedagogical technical school. I called three of the cars on duty on my portable radio and sent them to the scene of the incident. A little while later a taxi drove up to the regional department. The agitated driver said that hooligans had attacked his car. They had thrown stones and broken the windows. Then an assistant and I grabbed shields and rubber truncheons and went to the scene. About 150 people holding iron bars, chains and sticks had gathered in the courtyard of the DIPT [expansion unknown] dormitory. They were aggressive. We tried to calm and quieten them and convince them to disperse. However, in response we only had stones thrown at us. In this manner, we stood facing each other. But not for long.

Suddenly, isolated shouts rose from the crowd and everyone moved in the direction of the Tajikistan cinema. There the hooligan adolescents stopped. They broke the windows of the cinema. One large group rushed into the building. Another went toward the exit of the cinema. I do not know what went on inside. But, after a little while, the moviegoers poured out of the exit. Unwittingly, they fell directly under the rods and chains of the second group. The hooligans beat everyone in succession. They did not spare anyone - neither women, girls, the old nor the young. It was time to use fire-arms again. I shot into the air.

Then we managed to force the crowd toward the dormitories of the technical school. And with the assistance of those present we managed to drive the outrageous hooligans into the building. Somewhere in this turmoil one of the stones hit me in the head. It still hurt later. I went to the hospital.

[M. Lebedev] Why, in your opinion, did the disturbance continue for more than an hour and a half? Couldn't measures have been taken?

[V. Tur] Measures were taken, but at first, apparently, they were insufficient. In the beginning we had no idea of the magnitude of the incident.

A. Dronov, Young Pioneer leader.

In the evening, around 9:45, I was coming back from training with a friend. We were riding on a trolley bus. In addition to us, there were an elderly couple, two young girls and four or five boys on the bus. The bus stopped near the Tajikistan cinema. Someone shouted: "Get out!"

Since the driver did not open the door, the hooligans began to force them open and in a moment they tore into the bus. The driver managed to hide the girls in his booth, and despite the threats, protect them. The old people were severely beaten though, until they bled. When I was taken out of the trolley bus, I barely had chance to look around. Someone hit me forcefully on the head from behind with an iron bar, I think. I lost consciousness.

S. Khikmatulloev, student at the industrial pedagogical technical school.

In the evening, somewhere between nine and ten o'clock I went to wash. At that time, I heard a noise somewhere below. I did not pay much attention to it and began washing. Just then I was struck from behind with something blunt. I gained consciousness after everything had gone quiet.

S. Rakhmonov, student at the industrial pedagogical technical school.

On that evening, I heard a noise somewhere below, then it grew louder and louder. I thought it was an earthquake and dressed as I was, in shorts and a T-shirt, I jumped from the second story. Below the windows, several young guys began beating me with sticks. When I regained consciousness, I ran to the nearest dormitory. They called the ambulance for me.

Abduvali Rakhmonov, head of the administration of internal affairs, did not say anything, but he also received an injury. The policemen had shields and truncheons with them. They formed a barricade with their shields, but they only managed to stop the unrestrained hooligans after warning shots were fired into the air.

Yes, the "offenders and victims" included a variety of people (we are putting them in quotes because, on that evening, some of them fell into both groups). But you see any catchword or slogan could be given such an incensed crowd of young people. It appears that the entire complex of youth problems has currently gained a special urgency. And this problem needs to be solved not only by the law-protection agencies, but by all of us. Otherwise, where is the guarantee that something similar will not be repeated?

This is a U.S. Government publication. Its contents in no way represent the policies, views, or attitudes of the U.S. Government. Users of this publication may cite FBIS or JPRS provided they do so in a manner clearly identifying them as the secondary source.

Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FBIS) and Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) publications contain political, economic, military, and sociological news, commentary, and other information, as well as scientific and technical data and reports. All information has been obtained from foreign radio and television broadcasts, news agency transmissions, newspapers, books, and periodicals. Items generally are processed from the first or best available source; it should not be inferred that they have been disseminated only in the medium, in the language, or to the area indicated. Items from foreign language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed, with personal and place names rendered in accordance with FBIS transliteration style.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets { } are supplied by FBIS/JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpts] in the first line of each item indicate how the information was processed from the original. Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear from the original source but have been supplied as appropriate to the context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by the source. Passages in boldface or italics are as published.

SUBSCRIPTION/PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

The FBIS DAILY REPORT contains current news and information and is published Monday through Friday in eight volumes: China, East Europe, Soviet Union, East Asia, Near East & South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and West Europe. Supplements to the DAILY REPORTs may also be available periodically and will be distributed to regular DAILY REPORT subscribers. JPRS publications, which include approximately 50 regional, worldwide, and topical reports, generally contain less time-sensitive information and are published periodically.

Current DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are listed in *Government Reports Announcements* issued semimonthly by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161 and the *Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

The public may subscribe to either hardcover or microfiche versions of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications through NTIS at the above address or by calling (703) 487-4630. Subscription rates will be

provided by NTIS upon request. Subscriptions are available outside the United States from NTIS or appointed foreign dealers. New subscribers should expect a 30-day delay in receipt of the first issue.

U.S. Government offices may obtain subscriptions to the DAILY REPORTs or JPRS publications (hardcover or microfiche) at no charge through their sponsoring organizations. For additional information or assistance, call FBIS, (202) 338-6735, or write to P.O. Box 2604, Washington, D.C. 20013. Department of Defense consumers are required to submit requests through appropriate command validation channels to DIA, RTS-2C, Washington, D.C. 20301. (Telephone: (202) 373-3771, Autovon: 243-3771.)

Back issues or single copies of the DAILY REPORTs and JPRS publications are not available. Both the DAILY REPORTs and the JPRS publications are on file for public reference at the Library of Congress and at many Federal Depository Libraries. Reference copies may also be seen at many public and university libraries throughout the United States.

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

26 JULY 89